THE PHENOMENON OF CHRISTIAN INTERPOLATIONS INTO JEWISH APOCALYPTIC TEXTS: A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY AND METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

By

Gillis Byrns Coleman

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Religion

May, 1976

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:	Date:
	Jan 9, 1976
Paul W. Meyer	Jan. 9, 1976.
Walter Harrelson	Jan. 9, 1976
James L. Crenshaw	Jan. 9, 1976
Richard C. Wolf	January 9, 1976

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the assistance of a great host of people, this dissertation would neither have been attempted nor brought to its completion. Several of them deserve a special word of appreciation.

First, primary acknowledgment and thanks must be made to Professor Lou H. Silberman and Professor Leander E. Keck (now of Emory University), who suggested the need for such a study and helped to formulate specific goals and general procedures needed for the task. To their continuous assistance and encouragement belongs credit for the completion of this study. Dr. Paul W. Meyer, who replaced Dr. Keck on my committee, has been most helpful with his many suggestions and criticisms in the final stages of the writing. Each of those serving on the committee has been both friend and mentor; for this I am grateful.

Second, each of the following has been helpful at the several stages of research and writing. May this brief mention, impersonal as words on paper may appear, give notice of my sincere feelings of appreciation and gratitude. Wingate College granted two leaves-of-absence for classwork and research. The Wingate College Library staff was always willing to

2

trace volumes needed through inter-library loan. The efforts of Miss Dorothy Parks of the Vanderbilt Divinity School Library have been inexhaustible and indispensable in tracing needed materials and running references on the older, out-of-print, and almost impossible to get volumes. Two colleagues at Wingate College, Dr. Bobby G. Bell and Dr. Robert B. Barnes, read and made suggestions for revisions at several stages in the preparation of the manuscript. Mrs. Sharon Simpson Stegall, a former student and now a member of the secretarial staff at Wingate College, typed most of the final draft. To all of these I am most grateful.

Last, but certainly not least, I wish to thank my parents, Howard Elias Coleman and Jessie Mae Perry Coleman, who, although they had little formal education themselves, instilled in their six children the desire for what is good and right and best and the love for learning, and my wife, Alice, who, with me desires to instill the same love in our three: Jo Gillis, William Byrns, and Patrick Allen. It is to these people who are very special to me that I dedicate this study.

January 16, 1976 Gillis Byrns Coleman
Wingate College
Wingate, North Carolina

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.. iii

INTRODUCTION... 1

The Texts to be Investigated.................... 1
Guidelines for the Bibliographical Survey...... 4
The Methodological Analysis: Background and Procedure........................... 11

PART I. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY

THE APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM.............................. 49

THE TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM............................... 52

THE LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE (=APOCALYPSE OF MOSES)....... 55

III BARUCH (=GREEK APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH)...............

I ENOCH (=ETHIOPIC ENOCH)............................... 62

II ENOCH (=BOOK OF THE SECRETS OF ENOCH; SLAVONIC ENOCH).. 87

IV EZRA (=II ESDRAS)..................................... 92

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH................................ 107

THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES.................................. 115

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS................ 125

PART II. METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

CHAPTER I. THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH.................... 146

The Directions of Critical Research............ 149
The Position of A. Dillmann and R. H. Charles: The "Interpolation Theory"......... 156
Challenges to a Position........................ 167

CHAPTER II. THE 'SIMILITUDES' OF I ENOCH (CHS. 37-71)........................ 182

The Similitudes as a Jewish Document......... 186
The Similitudes as a Jewish Document with Christian Interpolations.................. 210
The Similitudes as a Christian Document...... 226
Preliminary Observations and a Tentative Conclusion............................. 236

CHAPTER III. THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.......................... 239

Early Research on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs....................... 242
The Testaments Seen as a Christian Document.. 244
The Interpolation Theory..................... 259
After R. H. Charles--Challenges to a Position................................ 292
Conclusions.................................. 311

CHAPTER IV. SEVEN OTHER APOCALYPTIC WRITINGS....... 313

The Life of Adam and Eve..................... 313
The Apocalypse of Abraham.................... 319
The Testament of Abraham..................... 324
The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch............... 333
The Book of the Secrets of Enoch............. 336
II Esdras (=4 Ezra).......................... 341
The Sibylline Oracles........................ 345
Conclusion................................... 349

CHAPTER V. OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS........... 351

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY............................ 364

INTRODUCTION

This study is concerned neither with "Jewish literature" nor with "Jewish apocalyptic literature" in general. Focusing rather on those particular _Jewish apocalyptic writings_ in which scholars generally have seen possible _Christian interpolations_, the purpose of this study is two-fold. First, using a prescribed list of journals along with major composite works and monograph materials, a bibliography has been assembled to serve as a research tool for those interested in these documents. Second, from a survey of the literature an attempt is made to detect and assess the various methodologies underlying the efforts of scholars to separate the Christian elements from the original Jewish materials in these texts.

The Texts to be Investigated

Scholars still debate both the definition of "apocalyptic" and subsequently which writings are to be correctly classified as apocalyptic,[1] as well as the question of the existence, nature, and extent of "Christian interpolations" in certain texts. Although the validity of these questions cannot be denied,[2] this study does not enter into these continuing debates. It has been necessary, however, at the outset to adopt a list of apocalyptic writings to serve as a working premise for the specific matters to be dealt with in this study. From the list of writings which are usually classified as "apocalyptic,"[3] notwithstanding

---

[1] Cf. James Kallas, "The Apocalypse--An Apocalyptic Book?" _JBL_, (1967): 69-80. Kallas's dogmatic rejection of the traditional treatment of the NT Apocalypse as "Apocalyptic" has set the stage for the re-emergence of the semantic battle among biblical scholars. This continuing debate was given some consideration in a paper presented at The Society of Biblical Literature, 107th Annual Meeting, October 28-31, 1971, Atlanta, Georgia--"Apocalyptic: Its Definition and

---

Relation to Wisdom" by John G. Gammie (University of Tulsa).

[2] See D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 36-69; 104-139. See also the following: Philip Vielhauer's introduction to "Apocalypses and Related Subjects" (trans. by David Hill) in Edgar Hennecke's New Testament Apocrypha, Vol. 2: Writings Relating to the Apostles, Apocalypses and Related Subjects, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, English translation edited by R. McL. Wilson. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 581-642. Stanley B. Frost, Old Testament Apocalyptic. Its Origins and Growth (London: The Epworth Press, 1952), pp. 3-17; Martin Rist, "Apocalyticism," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick, et al. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), 1: 157-161; H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, revised edition (New York: Association, 1963); see also Rowley's "Apocalyptic Literature," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, rev. ed., edited by H. H. Rowley and Matthew Black (New York: Nelson, 1962), pp. 484-488.

[3] Russell, Ibid., pp. 37-38, lists the following as "generally accepted as apocalyptic or having apocalyptic elements in them": The Book of Daniel, I Enoch, The Book of Jubilees, The Sibylline Oracles, The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs,The Psalms of Solomon, The Assumption of Moses, The Martyrdom of Isaiah, The Life of Adam and Eve, The Apocalypses of Abraham, The Testament of Abraham, II Enoch, II Esdras(=4 Ezra), II Baruch, and III Baruch. This list is paralleled, with slight variation by both E. Kautzsch and R. H. Charles. See Kautzsch (ed.), Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1900). Under the broad heading

certain variations, the following are generally treated as originally Jewish writings which were re-worked by Christian editors through a process of redaction and interpolation[4]; these ten texts are the focus of this study[5]:

I Enoch (=Ethiopic Book of Enoch)[6]
The Sibylline Oracles
The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs
II Esdras (=4 Ezra)
The Martyrdom of Isaiah
The Apocalypse of Abraham
The Testament of Abraham

"pseudepigraphische Apokalypsen." Kautzsch lists: the Sibylline Oracles, I Enoch, Assumption of Moses, 4 Esdras, Baruch (both the Syriac and the Greek), the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, and the Life of Adam and Eve. See also, R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913; reissued, 1963), Vol. 2: Pseudepigrapha. Charles differs from Kautzsch in the addition of one (II Enoch) and the omission of one (Life of Adam and Eve), which he puts, along with The Letter of Aristeas and The Martyrdom of Isaiah, under the larger heading: "Sacred Legends."

[4] A later section of this general introduction will deal specifically with the terms "redaction" and "interpolation" as they are used in various sources and how they are to be understood in this study.

[5] Summaries of these books can be found in C. C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945). A briefer, but still helpful, treatment is given by Artur Weiser, The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton (New York: Association Press, 1961), pp. 413-447. A perusal of these various Jewish texts (translations of eight of them are found in Charles, APOT 2; for translations of the Testament of Abraham and the Apocalypse of Abraham, see the bibliographies for these two texts) will show the validity of the questions scholars continue to ask concerning the definition and general characteristics of "apocalyptic" and the classification of certain ones.

[6] We have focused specifically on "The Similitudes" or "Parables" of I Enoch (chs. 37-71) where the question of Christian interpolations is most pertinent.

The Life of Adam and Eve (=The Apocalypse
    of Moses)
III Baruch (=The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch)
II Enoch (=The Book of the Secrets of Enoch=
    The Slavonic Book of Enoch)

Guidelines for the Bibliographical Survey

The extent and general makeup of the bibliography

The present bibliography, which has been compiled by using a prescribed list of major journals (from the time of their inception to 1970) along with sections drawn from larger studies, such as monographs and collected works specifically covers the ten Jewish apocalyptic texts listed above. Although the single point of interest in the discussion of methodology has been the question of Christian interpolations, the bibliography itself has not been limited merely to articles dealing with this question. In fact, few articles deal specifically with the question of Christian interpolations. Every reference found in the bibliographical survey pertaining to these ten texts has been included in the bibliography presented in Part I of this study. Thus, regardless of a reader's particular interest in any one or more of the texts treated in this study, the bibliography can serve his purpose since it is exhaustive to the extent of the prescribed list of journals and books. References culled from sources such as footnote citations which fall outside this prescribed list, are cited with complete bibliographical information rather than abbreviations or shortened titles.

Since journals are generally the battlefield of scholars, they have been of primary significance. It is here that reactions, responses, and refutations are usually recorded.[7] Book reviews are also many times quite significant, since they too reflect responses of various scholars to the way certain translations, commentaries, and text materials have been handled. Significant reviews for major volumes (e.g., Charles, Kautzsch, Burkitt, and Torrey) have been cited along with the reference to the volume itself.

Some authors use the review of a particular book as a beginning-point for an original contribution to the overall dialogue on apocalyptic, thus going beyond the usual "review" and evaluation of a new book or text translation.[8]

---

[7] This is well illustrated in the bibliography for II Enoch. A. S. D. Maunder's article, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," which appeared in The Observatory, 45 (London, 1918): 309-316, sought to prove an extremely late date for II Enoch and brought forth J. K. Fotheringham's praise and confirmation for the position taken, JThS 20 (1919-20): 252. This article, in turn, evoked, an answer from R. H. Charles, JThS 22 (1921): 161-163, which declared the insufficiency of the evidence for such a position, and which--again, in turn--led to a second article by Fotheringham. In this second article, "The Easter Calendar and the Slavonic Enoch," JThS 23 (1921-22): 49-56, Fotheringham again detailed his reasons for accepting a late date for II Enoch and reiterated his criticisms for the position of an early date held by Charles.

[8] A good example of this is F. C. Porter's review of Charles's major work of 1913 (APOT), "A Source Book of Judaism in New Testament Times," AJT 18 (1914): 106-118. Porter's methodological observations regarding literary analysis of documents of the type Charles covers are significant.

Where this has been the case, the article is treated as a separate entry in the bibliography with a cross reference to the volume under review.

To determine the "significant" books to be included, certain clues have been followed. First, the fact that a book turns up time and again in journal materials usually points to its importance. Second, the bibliographies listed in the following pivotal studies were useful in assessing the value of some of the older works:

> Charles, APOT, 2, 1913, and the individual volumes by Charles (e.g., The Book of Enoch, 1893; The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, 1896; The Greek Versions of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, 1908).
>
> Denis, Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament, 1970.
>
> Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des AT, Bd. 2, 1900.
>
> Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, 3, 1896.
>
> Lods, Histoire de la Litterature hebraique et juive, 1950.
>
> Oesterley, The Books of the Apocrypha. Their Origin, Teaching and Contents, 1914.
>
> Hennecke-Schneemelcher, NTA, 2, 1965 (ET)

No deliberate effort has been made to correlate the bibliographies given in almost every general introduction to a specific text (e.g., see Tisserant, Ascension d'Isaie, 1909, and Charles, The Book of Enoch, 1893). The reader who wishes to specialize on a given text will want to check the bibliographies given in the general introductions and translations of that text.

There are obviously many other works of comparable value to those cited in the present bibliography which have been omitted. Clearly, it would be impractical to try to include every general survey and reference book which cites various apocalyptic texts. Thus, volumes which could be cited only as "passim" have been omitted. A quick check of the index of topics and a rapid perusal of a volume like Jean Danielou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity (trans. and edited by John A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), or Joseph Bonsirven, Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ (trans. from the French by William Wolf. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963) will show the impracticality of trying to include general works of this type.

Brief annotations which follow certain entries are intended to clarify the content of the writing only where it is not already made clear by the title. In some cases, the annotations are intended to alert the reader that the title is misleading. Where articles are related as parts of a dialogue between scholars cross-references are indicated.

The arrangement and structure of bibliographical citations

In structuring the bibliography, certain liberties have been taken to facilitate the purpose of this study. First, a chronological arrangement has been used in order to detect possible trends, centers of interest, and shifts of emphasis. Although the purpose has not been to write a "history of research" of these Jewish texts, a recognition of the contours and consequences of this history is helpful in evaluating the methodologies at work in the treatment of these texts.

A second liberty has been taken in the form used in the bibliographical citations; namely book materials (where possible) are cited in the same way as journal articles. Two changes will be noticed. First, to facilitate the chronological arrangement, the date of publication of every book is cited along with the page numbers of the chapter or section. Second, wherever possible, titles of chapters and sections are quoted to indicate how a particular author has handled the materials. In many instances the titles are so general that this procedure offers little help; e.g., when a survey text like Torrey (The Apocryphal Literature, 1945) or Lods (Histoire de la Littérature hébraïque et juive, 1950) lists simply "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" or "Ethiopic Enoch." Occasionally, however, the title specifies the exact question to which the writer addresses himself. For example, the de Jonge articles on the

Testaments of the XII Patriarchs deal specifically with the relationship of the Testaments to the New Testament and the matter of "Christian interpolations"; from the title quoted in the bibliographic citations the reader knows the specific nature of the articles. This is also illustrated in a perusal of the I Enoch bibliography where, in several instances, the "Son of Man" issue is given special attention.

Limitations in the literature

The articles and monographs cover the usual critical questions such as date, original language, authorship, the place of origin, and the structure of the text. These writings have suffered a fate strikingly similar to that of most of the other literature in the category of pseudepigrapha--namely, few critical studies are available, and the writings have been relegated to a brief "summary" or "introduction" treatment, usually as part of an overall survey of the pseudepigraphical literature. Examples include many encyclopedia and Bible dictionary articles presented merely as background for the discussion of first century Judaism, intertestamental doctrinal developments, New Testament theology, or the early church fathers.

This type of brief and almost incidental treatment, as useful as it may be, suffers radically at two fundamental points. First, this approach tends to communicate only one tradition; generally, in American scholarship, this is the position established by R. H. Charles. Thus, a bibliographical tally to determine the consensus of scholarship on any one or more critical questions may mean very little, since it possibly represents only one or two pieces of research based on firsthand, independent acquaintance with the texts, while the remaining citations indicate the dependence of others upon the conclusions set forth by a few.[9]

Second, the predominance of a survey/introductory approach is misleading. It tends to leave the impression that these pseudepigraphical texts have significance only to the extent that they shed light on the "background" for several other areas (e.g., rabbinics, New Testament study, patristics, and the elusive "Jewish Christianity"). The reader may conclude that these writings have no value within themselves. The theology they reflect, the community which gave rise to or adapted and found this material useful within its religious life--all of this fades into the blurred, unfocused collage of ideas which forms the milieu for something else. The inherent significance of these particular writings within the context and life of the community which gave rise to them still awaits attention in future pseudepigrapha research.

---

[9] This judgment may be questionable since it seems to suggest that only the "expert" can write on a subject; this indeed would be devastating to the author of any type of "survey" or "introductory" text. Every man has his own field(s) of special interest and academic authority and must, of necessity, depend upon the research and scholarship of others in certain areas when he attempts to survey a particular field of study. (E.g., the multitude of OT and NT textbooks illustrates this fact.) The writer of such survey materials, however, is obligated to his readers to indicate the sources which form the basis for his own conclusions. Where divergent views are present, these need to be indicated. For example, in a recent study entitled History of Christian Thought. Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the Council of Chalcedon (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), pp. 90-93, the author, Justo Gonzalez, in a chapter "The Theology of the Apostolic Fathers" under the sub-topic "Other Christian Literature of the Same Period," without further ado labels the Ascension of Isaiah, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Secrets of Enoch as "the most important Christian books in the Old Testament pseudepigrapha" (p. 91). Although the writer seems to presuppose the composite nature, the interpolations, corrections, and revisions of already existing materials which went into the makeup of the present texts, the reader is sadly misled by both the arrangement and the brevity of the discussion of the materials.

The Methodological Analysis: Background and Procedure

The investigation of methodology in Part II of this study consists of a series of essays which sample the literature on each text to show the various methods used and the conclusions reached regarding possible Christian interpolations.

Although there is agreement that most of these Jewish apocalyptic texts have been reworked by Christians, there is no consensus on the extent of this reworking and editing process. For example, some scholars have interpreted the Similitudes of Enoch (chs. 37-71) as a Jewish writing containing Christian interpolations,[10] while others treat it as a Christian document.[11] Again, with reference to The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, the divergence ranges from those who treat this text as an original Christian composition,[12] to those who defend an "interpolation theory",[13] to those who see it as a work of the Qumran sect.[14] The same extremes are noted in the case of the Ascension of Isaiah. Both Dillmann[15] and Charles[16] treated the text as composite, having both Jewish and Christian elements, while Burkitt[17] and Burch[18] adamantly declared its Christian origin and unity.

---

[10] Cf. Matthew Black, "The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature," ET 60 (1948): 12. Also: "The Development of Judaism in the Greek and Roman Periods," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Black and Rowley, p. 697, section 608d.

---

[11] J. T. Milik drew this conclusion since the "Similitudes" section is the only portion of I Enoch not found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*, trans. by J. Strugnell (Naperville: Illinois, 1959), pp. 33-34.

[12] William J. Deane, *Pseudepigrapha* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891), pp. 162-192, and more recently, Marianus deJonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin* (Assen, Netherlands: Koninklijde Van Gorcum & Comp., N. V., 1953).

[13] Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: University Press, 1908; reissued, 1960); also, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Translated From the Editor's Greek Text, and Edited, With Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: A. and C. Black, 1908).

[14] Marc Philonenko, *Les Interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qoumrân* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960).

[15] August Dillmann, *Ascensio Isaiae, Aethiopice et Latine cum Prolegomenis, Adnotationibus Criticis* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1877), pp. V-XVIII.

[16] Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900): see too Charles's *APOT*, 2 (1913): 155-162.

[17] F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914), pp. 44-50, 72-74.

[18] Vacher Burch, "The Literary Unity of the *Ascensio*

The problem can be illustrated also with II Enoch (=The Book of the Secrets of Enoch). R. H. Charles scarcely gave a nod to the possibility of Christian elements in the text. In his 1896 edition of the text he admitted "occasional interpolations"; of these he wrote: "one or two are Christian."[19] Although in the introduction to the text in his major collection of 1913 he did not mention Christian elements, he bracketed several similar phrases as "Christian interpolations" (XXIX. 1, "Monday is the first day . . ."; cf. XXX.1, 2, 7, 8).[20] The other extreme is seen in a volume by Charles Francis Potter, Did Jesus Write This Book?,[21] in which the author dealt with the text of II Enoch and, in answer to the question, posed by his title, dogmatically declared: "Yes!"

Variation in the treatment of a text is to be expected. Extreme positions like those cited here, show the need for constant reexamination of methodology. Using the bibliographical survey, we have attempted, in the second

---

Isaiae," JThS 20 (1919): 17-23; also, "Material for the Interpretation of the Ascensio Isaiae," JThS 21 (1920): 249-265.

[19] R. H. Charles and W. R. Morfill, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896), pp. xxiv-xxv.

[20] APOT, 2, 425-469. (Esp. p. 447.)

[21] (New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1965).

part of this study, to detect and to evaluate the methodologies used by various scholars in bracketing certain passages within these Jewish texts as interpolations of "Christian" origin and intent. Our purpose has not been to adjudicate the existence of these interpolations, but rather to delineate the various positions taken and the method involved in establishing and maintaining such positions. Our procedure developed partly in examination of and in response to the textual directives and conclusions of R. H. Charles. Since his efforts in the area of apocrypha and pseudepigrapha have been monumental, our discussion has focused briefly upon his work as "central" in any treatment of this literature. Where possible we have discussed the individual texts in terms of the conclusions laid out by Charles. Not that the posited centrality of Charles's work suggests without question the correctness of his method or his conclusions, but rather the fact that his work marked both a culmination of what had gone before (sometimes in agreement with and sometimes contrary to it) and a signal of things to come in this area of research.

The following points are delineated here as background to the proposed procedure. First, some general observations summarize the thrust of Charles's contributions and the subsequent problem of scholarly over-dependence upon his conclusions. Second, the troublesome and sometimes confusing terminology is brought into focus with a word of caution

XUM

part of this study, to detect and to evaluate the methodologies used by various scholars in bracketing certain passages within these Jewish texts as interpolations of "Christian" origin and intent. Our purpose has not been to adjudicate the existence of these interpolations, but rather to delineate the various positions taken and the method involved in establishing and maintaining such positions. Our procedure developed partly in examination of and in response to the textual directives and conclusions of R. H. Charles. Since his efforts in the area of apocrypha and pseudepigrapha have been monumental, our discussion has focused briefly upon his work as "central" in any treatment of this literature. Where possible we have discussed the individual texts in terms of the conclusions laid out by Charles. Not that the posited centrality of Charles's work suggests without question the correctness of his method or his conclusions, but rather the fact that his work marked both a culmination of what had gone before (sometimes in agreement with and sometimes contrary to it) and a signal of things to come in this area of research.

The following points are delineated here as background to the proposed procedure. First, some general observations summarize the thrust of Charles's contributions and the subsequent problem of scholarly over-dependence upon his conclusions. Second, the troublesome and sometimes confusing terminology is brought into focus with a word of caution regarding a variety of terms used similarly and similar terms used sometimes quite differently. Third, a list of "interpolated" texts from Charles's APOT 2 (1913) is given for reference; many of these passages are used in the discussion in Part II to illustrate Charles's methodology.

An over-dependence on Charles

A peculiar problem encountered in the study of these Jewish apocalyptic texts is the fact that English speaking scholarship has been almost entirely dependent upon R. H. Charles's APOT, since its publication in 1913. The critical methods applied to this body of noncanonical materials by Charles and other scholars were essentially those which had come to be associated primarily with Graf and Wellhausen and their theory of source analysis of the Pentateuch. During the period between the two world wars, methodological advances of form and redaction criticism, generally associated with the works of men like Gunkel, Pedersen, von Rad, and Noth, challenged the more stringent application of the Graf-Wellhausen literary analysis and the straight-line evolutionary sketch of Israel's religious and political history.[22] Julius Wellhausen and F. C. Baur have not been abandoned, but biblical scholarship did not stop with them. Building on the valuable insights and contributions of these and other scholars, significant gains have been made. Unfortunately, in pseudepigraphical study the application of these methodological advances seem to be conspicously lacking, and the student of these materials is bound to critical methods developed more than fifty years ago.[23]

---

[22] Cf. Raymond A. Bowman, "Old Testament Research Between the Great Wars," in The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, edited by Harold R. Willoughby (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947), pp. 3-31; C. R. North, "Pentateuchal Criticism," in Old Testament and Modern Study, edited by H. H. Rowley (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 48-83).

In a prospectus written in 1947 entitled "The Future of Intertestamental Studies," Ralph Marcus acknowledged the merit and continuing usefulness of several older works, including Emil Schürer's *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesus Christi*, Wilhelm Bousset's *Die Religion des Judentums*, 3rd ed. by Gressmann (1926--with a revised title: *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, as part of Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*), and Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Yet, in spite of his praise for Schürer's work, published in its last edition some four decades before, Marcus's assessment was realistically pointed and revealed the theme of his entire article:

> . . . . we must all recognize that the time has come to revise and amplify this work and to produce a new synthesis that will incorporate

---

[23] Cf. J. C. Rylaarsdam, "Intertestamental Studies Since Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*," pp. 32-51, and Ralph Marcus, "The Future of Intertestamental Studies," pp. 190-208, in the volume edited by Harold R. Willoughby, *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*.

> the many important discoveries that have been made since 1907. What we need at the present time is a "new Schürer," . . .[24]

Marcus spoke similarly of the imposing two-volume corpus produced under the editorship of Charles. With sincere praise for this massive piece of scholarship, Marcus nevertheless concluded:

> . . . it came out more than thirty years ago; and as in the case of Schürer and Bousset-Gressmann, so in the case of the Charles Apocrypha, we are ready for a new collection of annotated translations.[25]

The need for a "new Charles," to adapt the language of Marcus, is no less today than when Marcus wrote in 1947. The lack of scholarly materials covering the range of pseudepigrapha and apocrypha written outside the Charles-Box-Osterley era is conspicuous when the bibliographical entries are noted chronologically. There is a clustering of materials around 1900, roughly from 1880 to 1920. There have been from time to time revivals of interest in the full range of pseudepigraphical literature. Otherwise, work with these materials both prior to and after the Charles era has been very general and without any specific focus of interest.

Charles's prominence in pseudepigraphical scholarship is indicated in the fact that his work ranged from general survey treatments of eschatology[26] and religious development of the intertestamental period[27] to more specific and detailed analysis of particular texts (e.g., Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, and others).[28] This prominence lent itself to an over-dependence of subsequent scholarship upon the Charles tradition. Another reason for this scholarly over-dependence, however, was Charles's critical and interpretative works on the specific texts. Although Marcus indicated the lack of critical and exegetical commentaries on the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and proposed that a project be undertaken to meet the need, Charles's work comes nearer to this type of "critical and exegetical commentary" treatment than other available works. Whatever criticisms may be offered, it is to Charles's credit that he made translations and critical annotations available--in spite of their occasional lack of necessary details. His critical annotations highlight sections needing special attention (e.g., variant readings of a text and sections which he interpreted as later interpolations) but he rarely gives the reasons for the

---

[24] Marcus, Ibid., p. 191.

[25] Ibid., p. 193.

[26] Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel,

Judaism, and Christianity. A Critical History (New York: Schocken Books, 1963: originally published in 1899; a second edition appeared in 1913).

[27] Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments (London: Williams and Norgate/New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1914).

[28] The Book of Enoch (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1893); The Ascension of Isaiah (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900); The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896); The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (London: A. and C. Black, 1908); The Apocalypse of Baruch (London, 1896).

way he handles the text. For example, many times he simply brackets a passage and notes that this is "obviously" a later interpolation without giving any explanation. A further frustration to the student of these materials is that usually there are no other comparable studies which can be used as "another point-of-view" against which Charles's work can be better assessed.

In short, the indictment against American and British scholarship for their over-dependence on the critical works of Charles cannot be denied; however, the reason is understandable. The bibliographical survey presented in Part I of this study underscores two significant facts. First, Charles still dominates the field in apocryphal and pseudepigraphical studies to the extent that his work becomes a watershed for all other major studies. Second, subsequent research has either accepted the evidence and conclusions offered by Charles or expended its energies seeking to refute them. His contributions cannot be ignored, and, in fact, few scholars have moved beyond his evidence and conclusions.

This study is not intended as a brief written to undergird a "new Charles movement," nor is it a defense in his behalf. The aim of the essays presented here is to explore and to describe the methodologies detected in the work of critical scholars in their approaches to these documents. In this effort, Charles's methods and conclusions have been invaluable as a pivotal point from which to view other significant positions, both those who wrote prior to and those who wrote after Charles produced his major studies.

The question of terminology

Our specific focus on "interpolations " requires clarification of terms at two points: (1) the concept of "redaction" as found in Charles and others of this earlier period; and (2) Charles's indiscriminate use of terms (i.e., interpolation, addition, gloss, and recast). First, we will look briefly at redaction as it was used in these earlier works.

When the term "redaction" is found (in Charles, for example) chronology cautions us not to read it as a description of post-World War II criticism; in many instances this may indeed be the correct meaning of the term, but in other cases it may be simply used to indicate an interpolation, addition, or gloss. Today the term "redaction" is generally used in the sense of editing, revising, or using preexisting materials.[29] Redaction applies to a manuscript in any of its various stages of development, a fact well established in both Pentateuchal studies and gospel research.[30] From this perspective, to take the Ascension of Isaiah as our example, both the Jewish narrative of Isaiah's death (which some scholars speculate had gone through one or more Jewish stages of revision and enlargement[31]) and the present text (which includes what many scholars feel to be later Christian additions to the original Martyrdom narrative[32]) are redacted texts; i.e., both the original document and the present Christian reworking of the original came into their final

---

[29] In modern scholarship the emphasis is also on the theological motive behind the arrangement of the materials; that is, the editor is less an "editor" in the sense of merely piecing together various materials, and more an "author" in the creative sense of saying something new in the way he actually handles the pieces. Redaction criticism builds on form criticism but does not stop with it. It goes on to focus on the document as a unified literary composition. Two recent studies which spell out this modern emphasis are: Norman Perrin, What Is Redaction Criticism? (Philadelphia: Fortress

---

Press, 1969); James M. Robinson, "On the Gattung of Mark (and John)," in Jesus and Man's Hope, Pittsburgh Festival on the Gospels, 1970 (Pittsburgh: A Perspective Book, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970), pp. 99-129. Robinson suggests that perhaps an improvement on Redactionsgeschichte would be Kompositionsgeschichte, esp. pp. 99-106; Perrin, however, recognizes "the problem of the relationship between redaction and composition" but contends that the day has not come in the development of 'composition' for us to be forced to make any real distinction. At the moment, he writes, "we are concerned with the discipline as it is currently being practiced" (pp. 65-67).

[30] An excellent treatment of this "growth" of religious tradition is Gerhard von Rad's two significant works: Genesis, trans. by John Marks (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 13-42; Old Testament Theology, I, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), pp. 105-305 (esp. pp. 129ff., "The Theology of the Hexateuch"). The same type of development of the NT writings is well illustrated in Martin Dibelius's From Tradition to Gospel, trans. in collaboration with the author by Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.), and Norman Perrin's What Is Redaction Criticism (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969).

[31] Cf. Lücke, Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes Zweyte Auflage (Bonn: bey Eduard Weber, 1852), pp. 274-302.

[32] Especially Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah, 1900 edition, and those who followed him.

forms through a process of revision and enlargement.

In his 1900 edition of the Ascension of Isaiah text, which Charles saw as containing both Jewish and Christian sections, he indicated here and there in his marginal notes that certain passages were "editorial additions" (e.g., i.13b, ii.9, iv.9-v.1a, v.15, 16, xi.41-43).[33] These are not bracketed as interpolations. In almost every instance, the "addition" is thought to serve as an editorial patch or transition which links sections together as smoothly as possible.

In the major work of 1913 under the editorship of Charles (APOT, 2), G. H. Box gave a similar description of the composite nature of IV Ezra.[34] Dealing only with what he felt was the Jewish work (chs. 3-14), Box described the text as "a compilation made by an Editor or Redactor" who had several independent sources at his disposal. The text was treated as having been brought into its present composite form by this Redactor, "the different material being welded together by redactional links and adjustments."

Charles and other scholars of this period used the term "redaction" as a description of this kind of editing of documents--i.e., linking or blending independent texts by the use of transitional materials which gave a semblance of unity to the newly created composite text. The redactor was thought to have had reasons for making such compilations or additions and perhaps the composite text speaks a message quite different from that of the original independent texts. In the case of the Ascension of Isaiah, Charles felt that the Christian redactor combined the 'Vision of Isaiah' (with its specifically Christian references to Jesus, the Apostles, the Holy Spirit, and the early church) with the Jewish 'Martyrdom of Isaiah'. He sought to give a semblance of unity to the composite document through the editorial comments; e.g., v.15, 16="This Beliar did to Isaiah . . . on account of the things which he had seen regarding the Beloved . . ." The text ends on the same note: "On account of these visions and prophecies Sammael Satan sawed in sunder Isaiah . . ." (xi. 41-43).[35] It is clear that the emphasis is not simply a historical reminiscence of Isaiah the prophet (if this had been the case, no reworking or adaptation by Christians would have been necessary), but rather the fact that via this Old Testament character of renown the Christian message is proclaimed.

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] APOT 2 (1913): 542.

In the case of IV Ezra, Box saw the compilation of sources as "a fusion" of the Rabbinical and Apocalyptic thought in Judaism. He maintained that the original sources were not seriously affected in this redaction process. "The purpose of the compilation appears to have been to commend the apocalyptic literature to certain Rabbinical circles which were hostile, and to secure for it a permanent place within orthodox Judaism."[36]

---

[35] The citations here are from Charles's 1900 edition of the text.

In short, we must underscore the fact that until the new door of biblical criticism began to open with the work of Wilhelm Wrede in 1901, earlier scholars spoke of a "redactor" of documents and "redactions" within a text, but only in a very limited sense. The "redactor" was seen in terms of an "editor" who compiled or fused separate writings with the glue of "editorial comments." We must recognize that the terms "redaction" and "interpolation" in the works of Charles, Box, Burkitt, Burch and others cannot be given the same emphasis as the same terms now found in the works of men like Marxsen, Bornkamm, and Conzelmann.

The second point needing brief clarification is Charles's use of various terms, such as "addition", interpolation", "recast", and "gloss", to describe the same textual phenomenon. This can be illustrated by the following citations from his 1913 edition of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs.[37] Charles labels TSimeon vi.5 as a "Christian addition," synonymous with his use of "Christian interpolaton" as evidenced in certain cross-references. His annotation for

---

[36] Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 542.

[37] All the citations here are from Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 296ff.

TSimeon vi.6 reads: "Cf. a like Christian interpolation in T.A. vii.3; also T.D. v.13d, vi.9." No note is given for TAsher vii.3, but the bracketed phrases are so similar to those in the Simeon passage that the reason for the cross-reference seems obvious. Similar phrases in TDan v.13d, vi.9 are also labeled "Christian additions."

A distinction can sometimes be seen when the term "interpolation" is used to describe an entirely new thought inserted into a passage which appears to be complete in itself. An insertion of this kind does not disrupt the continuity of the passage and is usually isolated on the grounds of its content. However the term "addition" frequently is used to identify to a word or phrase--not completely new idea--which does, in fact, alter the meaning of the passage, sometimes radically. The following passages illustrate this. TSimeon vi. 5, with its "Christian addition," reads:

> Then shall Shem (MSS. 'Seth') be
> glorified,
> For the Lord our God shall appear
> on earth [as man]
> And Himself saves again.

This is illustrated again in Charles's designation of similar phrases in TLevi xviii.7 and TNaphtali viii.3 as "a Christian addition" and "a Christian interpolation?" consecutively.

TSimeon vii. 7, described as a "Christian interpolation," reads:

> Then shall I arise in joy,
> And will bless the Most High

XUM

> because of his Marvelous
> works,
> [Because God hath taken a body
> and eaten with men and
> saved men.]

Since Charles uses the terms interchangeably and apparently makes no distinctions whatever in them, any distinction which we make in attempting to assess his work on the texts would be artificial and without value.

Charles frequently leaves the question open whether a passage is a "Christian interpolation" or a "recast by Christian scribes" (e.g., TLevi xvi.3). The same idea is expressed in his use of the phrase "Christian alteration" (e.g., TNaphtali viii.3). The term "gloss" is used to label similar passages in the Books of Adam and Eve, xxix.2 and The Sibylline Oracles, Book III, line 776.

In short, Charles made little or no distinction in the terms he employed when speaking of a Christian reworking of a text. He used several descriptive phrases to designate this process of Christian adaptation. The procedure of this study, when citing examples from Charles and others, is to use the same term that they used. In the essays presented in this study, however, "interpolation" is the umbrella-term used to include all of these. Regardless of the specific designation used in annotating a text, the question remains the same: on what methodological grounds can this word, phrase, verse, or section be categorized and defended as a Christian interpolation (redaction, addition, alteration, recast, or gloss)?

For reference: Charles's "interpolations"[38]

The following list is given here for reference. Some of the more pertinent passages will be discussed in the examination of methodology in Part II. For convenience the books are listed alphabetically. Every passage is given (including some which, according to Charles, are definitely not Christian additions) which may be helpful to the reader in seeking an overview of the particular emphasis of this study. For example, in his treatment of the Similitudes of Enoch (I Enoch 37-71), Charles brackets large sections here and there as "interpolations," none of which, according to his interpretation of I Enoch, is Christian. They are listed because of their potential value in understanding Charles's work with this text.

1. The Books of Adam and Eve

   vi. 2 (cf. xix. 2)
   xxix. 2; 3-10
   xlii. 2-5
   xliii. 3
   li. 2
   (From the Apocalypse of Moses the following are noted: xli. 2, 3; xliii. 2, 5)

2. The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (=III Baruch)

   4:9-15
   6:8
   13:4

---

[38] Unless otherwise stated, the citations for reference are from Charles, APOT 2 (1913).

15:4
(Cf. also 1:7 and 11:2 with Charles's notes.)

3. Similitudes of Enoch (=I Enoch 37-71)

None of the following sections is designated as Christian. Charles labeled them simply "interpolations" and believed them to be fragments of an ancient "Book of Noah." They have value in our efforts to understand his method of working with a text. Other interpreters who will be discussed in detail in Part II, have seen definite Christian elements in these chapters.

XXXIX. 1, 2a
XLII.
LIV. 7 - LV. 2
LX. 1
LXIX. 22-24 (cf. Charles's note on 23c)
LXXI. 14-17

4. The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (=II Enoch)

16:5
29:1 (and several similar phrases to follow)
ch.37 (bracketed in Charles's 1896 edition)

5. IV Ezra

chs. 1-2
chs. 15-16

Charles limited the text to chs. 3-14. In the general introduction passing notice is given to chs. 1-2 and chs. 15-16 as belonging only to the Latin form of the book. Other scholars saw these sections as later (and, possibly) Christian additions; Bloch bracketed several phrases as "christological" in nature and intent (i.e., 7:28, 29; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9).[39]

---

[39] J. Bloch, "Some Christological Interpolations in the

For reference purposes here, only the prologue and epilogue sections are noted.

6. The Ascension of Isaiah

In his 1913 volume, Charles considered only the Jewish narrative (i.e., 'The Martyrdom of Isaiah'). The following, which are indicative of his methodology, will be helpful:

1:2b-6a (this section is omitted and noted as "Christian")
1:7
1:13
2:12-16
3:12

From the 1900 edition, Charles labeled the following as Christian additions to the original Jewish narrative:

3:13b-6:18 ('The Testament of Hezekiah')
6:1- 11:40 ('The Vision of Isaiah')

7. The Sibylline Books

Book III, lines 63-92
lines 93-96
line 776
Book IV, lines 28, 29, 117, 168
Book V, lines 256-259 (cf. also line 68 which Charles described as "perhaps Christian")

8. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

TReuben 2:3-3:2
3:7
6:7
TSimeon 4:8
6:5
6:7
TLevi 2:7-3:10 (one of the few times Charles used the term "redaction")
2:11
3:5-8
4:1, 4

Ezra-Apocalypse," HThR 51 (1958): 87-94.

	8:5
	10:2
	14:1, 2
	16:3, 5
	17:2
	18:7, 9
TJudah	17:2-18:1
	18:1
	21:6-ch. 23
	22:2
	24:5-6
TIssachar	4:6
TDan	4:3
	5:13
	6:9
TNaphtali	8:3
TGad	2:3-5
	6:5
	8:2
TAsher	7:3
	7:4-7
TJoseph	3:7
	19:8, 11
TBen	9:3-5
	10:7-9
	ch. 11

General procedure

In the discussion of the individual texts, our procedure moves along several lines. First, as already indicated, where possible the position of R. H. Charles is set out as the pivot around which the discussion centers. Even though this prevents, in some instances, adherence to a strict chronological presentation, it appears to be, nonetheless, logical and less confusing, since almost every other approach to the various texts has to be viewed in the light of the norm that came to be associated with the works of Charles. Second, from this central position, the discussion encompasses representative works both prior to and after the Charles era.

It is helpful to review the general directions, shifts, and consequences of this history in order to get some hold on the various approaches to these Jewish apocalyptic documents. At this point, however, the discussion proceeds cautiously, since our purpose is not to write a "history of research."

The discussion is guided by two major considerations. First, it has been necessary in several instances to sketch the background out of which the interpolation theory eventually emerged. For example, in the earliest treatments of the Ascension of Isaiah, the question of origin was not even entertained; the interpretation rested on the unquestioned assumption that the writing was Christian. Only later did the view begin to emerge which culminated in the works of Dillmann and Charles, who both interpreted the text as an original Jewish narrative later reworked by Christian editors. The earlier background out of which this later view arose has to be regarded with all seriousness in order to appreciate fully the issues involved in the traditional treatment of the Ascension text. Second, a survey of the literature leaves little doubt that the methodologies, in many cases, have been divergent and the subsequent conclusions equally as divergent. It is increasingly evident that whoever undertakes to investigate the phenomenon of Christian interpolations into Jewish texts must ask "On what methodological grounds is the interpolation idea rejected?" as well as "On what grounds is it accepted?" A willingness to explore the first question, and it cannot be ignored, demonstrates the methodological possibilities in the treatment of various texts and subsequently helps to sharpen the critical insights needed to handle adequately the second. The several positions highlighted in the discussion are those which best illustrate these two questions.

The discussion is in no sense exhaustive, but rather representative. The sampling has been extensive enough and selective enough to permit some valid generalizations and tentative conclusions (to be set forth in our final section) which will indicate where we have been, what our present status is, and some future directions to be followed in dealing with these apocalpytic texts.

Third, the various procedures detected in the representative approaches are reviewed and tentative assessments given in the discussion of each text. The assessments, of necessity, are tentative. In the final section of this study, the attempt is made to give some semblance of order and unity to the many segments of this investigation. These individual segments have looked--each in turn--at representative research on specific Jewish apocalyptic texts with an eye for possible clues which point to the methodologies used by this or that scholar on this or that particular text. The final section attempts to take in the entire picture. The question will be the same: what are the methods used to isolate possible Christian interpolations in these particular Jewish writings?

But the answer hopefully will be more inclusive, since the focus will not be limited to this text in the hands of this scholar, but rather these texts, these scholars. At that point, we will draw upon our tentative assessments and conclusions set forth in the course of the discussions of individual texts in an effort to analyze the overall patterns of methodology (if, in fact, any overall patterns can be isolated).

In the concluding section, the questions with which we began our study will be central. (1) What were the discernible criteria used by Charles and others of his period in determining both the possible Christian interpolations and the extent of these interpolations within a Jewish apocalyptic text? (2) Has there been any consistency in the application of these criteria, or has this research been carried on in a piecemeal fashion? In other words, when the work of one scholar is compared with that of another on a particular text, is there evidence of agreement on methodology used in identifying the insertions and additions? Likewise, the question must be asked in a way that would also include comparisons of different scholars on different texts and of the same scholar on different texts. (3) Does the literature on the specific texts under consideration in this study indicate any methodological advances since the work of R. H. Charles?

PART I

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations for the periodicals and the composite works are from: Schwertner, Siegried (ed.). *Internationales Abkurzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1974. The following which were not listed by Schwertner have been assigned abbreviations which have been followed in the bibliographies: The Biblical Review, The International Journal of Apocrypha, Iliff Review, A Dictionary of Comparative Religion, The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion, and New Testament Apocrypha (Hennecke-Schneemelcher).

Periodicals

AASOR = Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem (1919/1920 ff.)

ACQR = American Catholic Quarterly Review (Philadelphia, 1876-1923)

AJP = American Journal of Philology (Baltimore, 1880 ff.)

AJSL = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures (Chicago, 1895-96; first volume is numbered XII, continuing *Hebraica* which ran for eleven years.)

AJT = American Journal of Theology (Chicago, 1897-1920; replaced by *Journal of Religion*)

ARW = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft (Leipzig, Berlin, 1898-1939)

AThR = Anglican Theological Review (Evanston, Illinois/Sewanee, Tennessee, 1918 ff.)

BA = The Biblical Archaeologist (New Haven, Conn., 1938 ff.)

BetM = Bet(h)-Mikra (Jerusalem, 1956 ff.)

Bib = Biblica (Rome, 1920 ff.)

BibReview = The Biblical Review (New York, 1916-1932)

BiTr = The Bible Translator (London, 1950 ff.)

BJRL = The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Manchester, 1903 ff.)

BR = Biblical Research (Chicago, 1956 ff.)

Bridge = The Bridge. A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies (Newark, N. Y., 1955 ff.)

BS = Bibliotheca Sacra (Dallas, Texas, 1844 ff.)

BW = The Biblical World (Chicago, 1893-1920)

BZ = Biblische Zeitschrift (Paderborn, 1903-1918; interrupted after WWI; regular publication again 1931-1939; N. F. began in 1957.)

CBQ = The Catholic Biblical Quarterly (Washington, D. C., 1939 ff.)

CJRT = Canadian Journal of Religious Thought (Toronto, 1924-1932)

CJT = Canadian Journal of Theology (Toronto, 1955 ff.)

CrozQ = Crozer Quarterly (Chester, Pa., 1924-1952)

CTM = Concordia Theological Monthly (St. Louis, Mo., 1930 ff.)

EstB = Estudios biblicos (Madrid, 1941 ff.)

ET = The Expository Times (Edinburgh, 1889 ff.)

EThL = Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses (Leuven-Louvain, 1924 ff.)

EvQ = Evangelical Quarterly (London, 1929 ff.)

EvTh = Evangelische Theologie (München, 1934 ff.)

Exp = The Expositor (London, 1875-1925)

FZPhTh = Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie (Freiburg [Schweiz], 1954 ff.)

HeyJ = Heythrop Journal (Oxford, 1960 ff.)

HibJ = The Hibbert Journal (London, 1902 ff.)

HThR = Harvard Theological Review (Cambridge, Mass., 1908 ff.)

HUCA = Hebrew Union College Annual (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1900 ff.)

IEJ = Israel Exploration Journal (Jerusalem, 1950 ff.)

IJA = International Journal of Apocrypha (London, 1905-1917)

IliffRev = Iliff Review (Denver, 1945 ff.)

Interp. = Interpretation; A Journal of Bible and Theology (Richmond, Va., 1947 ff.)

JAAR = Journal of the American Academy of Religion (Missoula, Montana; formerly called Journal of Bible and Religion, Brattleboro, Vermont; 1933 ff.)

JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven, Conn., 1843 ff.)

JBR = Journal of Bible and Religion (Now called Journal of the American Academy of Religion; see above, JAAR.)

Jdm = Judaism: A Quarterly Journal of Jewish Life and Thought (New York, 1952 ff.)

JEH = Journal of Ecclesiastical History (Edinburgh/London, 1950 ff.)

JJS = Journal of Jewish Studies (London, 1948/49 ff.)

JNES = Journal of Near Eastern Studies (Chicago, 1942 ff.)

JQR = Jewish Quarterly Review (London, 1889-1908; New Series, Philadelphia, 1910 ff.)

JR = Journal of Religion (Chicago, 1921; replaced American Journal of Theology; see above, AJTh)

JRH = Journal of Religious History (Sydney, Australia, 1960 ff.)

JRT = Journal of Religious Thought (New York, 1943 ff.)

JSJ = Journal for the Study of Judaism (Leiden, March 1970 ff.)

JSSt = Journal of Semitic Studies (Manchester, 1956 ff.)

JThS = Journal of Theological Studies (Oxford/London, 1899/1900 ff.; n.s. began in 1950.)

Jud = Judaica. Beiträge zum Verständnis des jüdischen Schicksals in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart (Zürich, 1945 ff.)

KuD = Keryma und Dogma. Zeitschrift für theologische Forschung und kirchliche Lehre (Göttingen, 1955 ff.)

LuthQ = The Lutheran Church Quarterly (Gettysburg; Philadelphia, 1928-1948; name has varied; prior to 1928 and since 1948, the name has been simply Lutheran Quarterly Review.)

MGWJ = Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums (Breslau, 1851-1939)

Muséon = Muséon. Revue d'études orientales. (Louvain, 1900 ff. [n.s.])

NedThT = Nederlands (ch) e theologisch Tijdschrift (Wageningen, 1946 ff.)

NRTh = Nouvelle Revue theologique (Paris, 1869 ff.)

NT = Novum Testamentum. An International Quarterly for New Testament and Related Studies. (Leiden, 1956 ff.)

NThSt = Nieuve theologische Studiën (Groningen, Den Haag, 1918-1942)

NThT = Nieuw theologisch Tijdschrift (Haarlem, 1912-1946)

NTS = New Testament Studies (Cambridge, England, 1954 ff.)

Numen = Numen. International Review for the History of Religions (Leiden, 1954 ff.)

OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung (Berlin; Leipzig, 1898 ff.)

PAAJR = Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research (Philadelphia, 1928 ff.)

PTR = The Princeton Theological Review (Princeton, N. J., 1903-1929)

RB = Revue biblique (Paris, 1892 ff.; n.s. from 1903 ff. Publication interrupted from 1941-46 and replaced with *Vivre et Penser*, Vols. 1-3; regular publication continued in 1946.)

RBen = Revue bénédictine (Maredsous, 1884 ff.)

RdQ = Revue de Qumrân (Paris, 1958/59 ff.)

RÉJ = Revue des Études juives et Historia judaica (Paris, 1880 ff. *Revue des Études juives* merged with *Historia judaica* in 1962.)

RevSR = Revue des Sciences religieuses (Strasbourg, 1927 ff.)

RExp = The Review and Expositor (Louisville, Ky., 1904 ff.)

RHLR = Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature religieuses (Paris, 1896-1922)

RHPhR = Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses (Strasbourg, 1921 ff.)

RHR = Revue de l'Histoire des Religions (Paris, 1880 ff.)

RR = Review of Religion (New York, 1936-1958)

RSPhTh = Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques (Paris, 1907 ff.)

RSR = Recherches de Science religieuse (Paris, 1910 ff.)

RThAM = Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale (Louvain, 1929-1964; continued as *Bulletine de Theologie ancienne et médiévale*.)

RTR = The Reformed Theological Review (Hawthorn, Australia, 1942 ff.)

Scrip. = Scripture: The Quarterly of the Catholic Biblical Association (London, 1946 ff.)

Sem = Semitica (Paris, 1948 ff.)

SJTh = Scottish Journal of Theology (Edinburgh, 1948 ff.)

StTh = Studia theologica. Scandinavian Journal of Theology. (Lund, Aarhus, 1947 ff.)

SvTK = Svensk teologisk Kvartalskrift (Lund, 1925 ff.)

Textus = Textus. Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project (Jerusalem, 1960 ff.)

ThBl = Theologische Blätter (Leipzig, 1922-1942)

Theol. = Theology: A Journal of Historic Christianity (London, 1920 ff.)

ThGl = Theologie und Glaube (Paderborn, 1908 ff.)

ThJb(T) = Theologische Jahrbücher (Tübingen, 1842-1857)

ThLZ = Theologische Literaturzeitung (Leipzig, 1876-1944; incorporated into Theologische Literaturblatt, ThLBl)

ThR = Theologische Rundschau (Tübingen, 1898 ff.)

ThRv = Theologische Revue (Munster, 1902 ff.)

ThStKr = Theologische Studien und Kritiken (Hamburg; Gotha, 1828-1938)

ThT = Theologisch Tijdschrift (Amsterdam; Leiden, 1867-1919)

ThTo = Theology Today (Princeton, 1944 ff.)

ThZ = Theologische Zeitschrift (Basel, 1945 ff.)

VD = Verbum domini (Rome, 1921 ff.; publication suspended between 1944-1947.)

VigChr = Vigilae christianae; A Review of Early Christian Life and Language (Leiden, 1947 ff.)

VivPen = Vivre et Penser; recherches d'exegese et d'histoire (Paris, 1941-1945; =Vols. 50-52 of Revue Biblique)

VT = Vetus Testamentum. Quarterly Published by the International Organization of Old Testament Scholars. (Leiden, 1951 ff.)

WThJ = The Westminster Theological Journal (Philadelphia, 1938 ff.)

ZAW = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (Giessen; Berlin, 1881 ff.)

ZDMG = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft (Leipzig; Wiesbaden, 1847 ff.)

ZKTh = Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (Innsbruck, 1877 ff.)

ZNW = Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der alteren Kirche (Giessen; Berlin, 1900 ff.)

ZRGG = Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte (Köln, 1948 ff.)

ZSTh = Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie (Gütersloh; Berlin, 1923-1955)

ZThK = Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche (Tübingen, 1891 ff.)

ZWTh = Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie (Jena; Halle; Leipzig, 1858-1914)

Composite Works

APAT^2 = Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten

Testaments. Übersetzt und herausgegeben von E. Kautzsch. Zweiter Band: Die Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900.

See the following reviews: ET 10 (1898-99): 120-121; 265-266 (J. A. Selbie); ZWTh 43 (1900): 300-308 (A. Hilgenfeld); RHR 42 (1900): 282-289 (A. Lods).

APOT = The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, edited in Conjunction With Many Scholars by R. H. Charles. Vol 2: Pseudepigrapha. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913; reissued, 1963.

See the following review article: Porter, F. Ch. "A Source Book of Judaism in New Testament Times." AJTh, 18 (1914), 106-118.

CathEnc = The Catholic Encyclopedia. 15 Volumes. Edited by Charles G. Herbermann and others. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907 to 1914.

DAC = Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. 2 Volumes. Edited by James Hastings, With the Assistance of John A. Selbie and John C. Lambert. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons/Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922.

DB(H) = A Dictionary of the Bible. 4 Volumes plus an "Extra Volume: Containing Articles, Indexes, and Maps." Edited by James Hastings and Others. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons/ Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911-1912.

DBS = Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément. Commencé par Louis Pirot, et André Robert; continué sous la direction de Henri Cazelles et André Feuillet. Paris: Librairie Létouzey et Ané, Editeurs, 1928-1967. Only eight volumes have appeared.

DCB = A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines. 4 Volumes. Edited by William Smith and Henry Wace. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1877 to 1887.

DCR = *A Dictionary of Comparative Religion*. Edited by Brandon, S. G. F. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.

DThC = *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*. 15 Tomes. Commencé sous la direction de A. Vacant, et E. Mangenot; continué sous celle de E. Amann, *et al*. Paris: Librairie Létouzey et Ané, 1930 to 1950.

EB(C) = *Enclyclopedia Biblica. A Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 Volumes. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. New York: The Macmillan Company/London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899 to 1903.

EJ(D) = *Encyclopaedia Judaica. Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Jacob Klatzkin (Chefredakteur), *et al*. Berlin: Verlag Eschkol A.-G., 1928-1934.

EJR = *The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion*. Edited by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.

IDB = *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 Volumes. Edited by George A. Buttrick, *et al*. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

JE = *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. 12 Volumes. Edited by Isidore Singer, *et al*. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1901-1905.

NSHE = *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. 12 Volumes. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson, *et al*. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1908-1912.

NTA = *New Testament Apocrypha*, by Edgar Hennecke. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. English translation edited by R. McL. Wilson. Vol. II: *Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965. See the following reviews of Hennecke's *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*: *RB* 3 (1906):

624-629; *JThS* 25 (1924-25): 184, 422 (M. R. James); *JR* 4 (1925): 427 (S. J. Case).

RE^2 = *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. 24. Bands. Begründet von J. J. Herzog. 2. Auflage. Herausgegeben von Plitt und Hauck. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1877-1888.

RE^3 = *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. 24. Bands. Begründet von J. J. Herzog. 3. Auflage. Herausgegeben von Albert Hauck, *et al*., 1896-1913.

RGG^3 = *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*. 6. Bands. 3. Auflage. Herausgegeben von Kurt Galling, *et al*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957-1962.

UJE = *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*. 10 Volumes. Edited by Isaac Landman, *et al*. New York: The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., 1939-1943.

Shortened Titles are used for the Following Books

Abbott, Edwin A. *The Son of Man, or Contributions to the Study of the Thoughts of Jesus*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1910.

Bentzen, Aage. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. Third edition. Translated by the author. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gads Forlag, 1957.

Birnbaum, Philip. *A Book of Jewish Concepts*. New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1964.

Bissell, Edwin Cone. *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. Vol. 15 of *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, by John Peter Lange. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880.

Borsch, Frederick Houk. *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. The Westminster Press, 1967.

Burkitt, F. Crawford. *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. London: Oxford University Press, 1914.
See the following article by Kaufmann Kohler which points out basic weaknesses in the approaches of both Charles and Burkitt: "The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature." *JQR*, n.s., 11 (1920-21), 145-168.

Charles, R. H. *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity--A Critical History*. 2nd. edition. London; 1913. Reissued: New York: Schocken Books, 1963.
See the following article by Kaufmann Kohler which points out basic weaknesses in the approaches of both Charles and Burkitt: "The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature." *JQR*, n.s., 11 (1920-21), 145-168.

________. *Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1914.

Deane, William J. *Pseudepigrapha: An Account of Certain Apocryphal Sacred Writings of the Jews and Early Christians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891.

Denis, Albert-Marie. *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes-grecs d'Ancien Testament*. Vol. 1 of *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudépigrapha*, edited by A. M. Denis and M. de Jonge. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
For an introduction to the project, see the following: Denis, Albert-Marie. "Les Pseudépigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament." *NT* 6 (1963): 310-319; Denis, Albert-Marie, and M. de Jonge. "The Greek Pseudepigrapha of the *OT*." *NT* 7 (1965): 319-328.

Drummond, James. *The Jewish Messiah. A Critical History of the Messianic Idea Among the Jews From the Rise of the Maccabees to the Closing of the Talmud*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament, An Introduction*. 2 Vols. Trans. from the 3rd German edition by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Ewald, Heinrich. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Zweiter Ausgabe. Bd. VII. Göttingen: In der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung, 1859. (A 3rd. edition appeared in 1868.)

Ferrar, W. J. *The Uncanonical Jewish Books; A Short*

Introduction to the Apocrypha and Other Jewish Writings, 200 B.C.--100 A.D. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918.

Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews.* 5 Volumes. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1936.

Goldin, Hyman E. *The Book of Legends. Tales From the Talmud and Midrash.* 3 Volumes. New York: The Jordan Publishing Co., Inc., 1929.

Greenstone, Julius H. *The Messiah Idea in Jewish History.* Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1906.

Harnack, Adolf. *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius.* 2. Bds. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897.

Herford, R. T. *Talmud and Apocrypha.* London: The Soncino Press, 1933.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung.* Amsterdam: Editions RODOPI, 1966. [Nachdruck der Ausgabe Jena 1857.]

Hughes, H. Maldwyn. *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature.* London: Robert Culley, 1928? .

James, M. R. *Old Testament Legends.* London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913.

Klauser, Joseph. *The Messianic Idea in Israel.* Trans. from the 3rd. Hebrew edition by W. F. Stinespring. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.

Lagrange, M.-J. *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ.* Paris: J. Gabalda et Fils, Editeurs, 1931.

Leszynsky, Rudolf. *Die Sadduzäer.* Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1912.

Lods, Adolphe. *Histoire de la Littérature hébraïque et juive.* Paris: Payot, 1950.

Lücke, Friedrich. *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes oder Allgemeine Untersuchungen über die apokalyptische Litteratur überhaupt und die Apokalypse des Johannes* *insbesondere*. Zweyte Auflage. Bonn: bey Eduard Weber, 1852.

Manson, T. W. *The Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1935.

Oesterley, W. O. E. *The Books of the Apocrypha. Their Origin, Teaching and Contents*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1914.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *History of New Testament Times. With an Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.

Rappoport, Angelos S. *Myth and Legend of Ancient Israel*. With an Introduction and Additional Notes by Raphael Patai. 3 Volumes. KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1966.

Riessler, Paul. *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel, übersetzt und erlautert*. 2. Auflage. Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1966.

Rowley, H. H. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*. Rev. edition. New York: Association Press, 1963. (First published in 1944.)

Russell, D. S. *Between the Testaments*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960.

________. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Schreiner, Josef. *Alttestamentlich-jüdische Apokalyptik. Eine Einführung*. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1969.

Schürer, Emil. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Dritter Band. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1970. [Zweiter reprografischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig, 1909.]

________. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Second revised edition. Trans. by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. Second Division, Vol. III. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. (This volume was re-issued in 1972 by Schocken Books, New York, under the title: *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*. Edited with an Introduction by Nahum N. Glatzer.)

Sellin, Ernst. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Trans. by W. Montgomery. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923.

Strack, Hermann L. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament; Einschliesslich Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen*. 6 Auflage. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1906.

Tennant, F. R. *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1903.

Thomson, John E. H. *Books Which Influenced Our Lord and His Apostles: Being a Critical Review of Apocalyptic Jewish Literature*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. *The Apocryphal Literature. A Brief Introduction*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945. See the following reviews: ThTo 3 (1946-47): 418-421 (W. F. Albright); *RR* 11 (1947): 177-181 (Luitpold Wallach).

Volz, Paul. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur*. Zweite Auflage des Werkes "Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba" 1903 . Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934.

Waxman, Meyer. *A History of Jewish Literature*. Vol. 1: *From the Close of the Canon to the End of the Twelfth Century*. London: Thomas Yosefoff, 1960.

Weiser, Artur. *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton. New York: Association Press, 1961.

Zöckler, D. Otto. *Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments nebst einem Unhang über die Pseudepigraphenliteratur*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1891.

THE APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM

Decourdemanche, J.-A. "La Légende d'Abraham d'apres les Musulmans." *RHR* 22 (1890): 54-76.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada: C. The Apocalypse of Abraham and Its Kindred." *JQR*, o.s., 7 (1894-95): 581-606.

Kohler makes no apparent distinction between the *Testament* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*; the article dwells on the *Testament*. Cf., *Origins* (1929), pp. 180-184.

Bonwetsch, G. Nathanael. *Die Apokalypse Abrahams. Das Testament der vierzig Märtyrer*. Band I, Heft 1: *Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche*. Herausgegeben von N. Bonwetsch und R. Seeberg. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchdlg. Nachf. (G. Bohme), 1897. See esp. pp. 1-70.

Lejay, Paul. "Ancienne Philologie Chrétienne: 4. Apocryphes." *RHLR*, 5 (1900): 67-69.

The author gives a brief reference to the work by N. Bonwetsch's *Apokalypse Abrahams*.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *JE* 1 (1901): 91-92.

Lagrange, M.-J. "Notes sur le messianisme au temps de Jésus: L'Apocalypse d'Abraham." *RB* 2 (1905): 511-514.

Reid, George J. "The Apocalypse of Abraham." *CathEnc*, 1 (1907): 604.

Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends*, 1 (1909): 209-306; 5 (1925): 217-218, 229-230.

Schurer, Emil. "Die Apokalypse Abrahams." *Geschichte*, 3 (1909): 336-338.

James, M. R. "Abraham," *OT Legends* (1913), pp. 27-48.

Box, G. H. *The Apocalypse of Abraham. Edited, With A Translation from the Slavonic Text and Notes*. London: Society for the Promoting of Christian

XUM

Knowledge, 1919.

Schmitz, Otto. "Abraham im Spätjudentum und im Urchristentum." *Aus Schrift und Geschichte; theologische Abhandlungen Adolf Schlatter zu seinem 70. Geburtstage*. Dargebracht von Freunden und Schulern, von Karl Bornhauser, *et al*. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1922.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "Gehenna and Paradise in the Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament." *Heaven and Hell* (1923), pp. 59-80, passim. See esp. pp. 74-76.

Frey, J.-B. "Abraham (Apocalypse d')." *DBS* 1 (1928), cols. 28-33.

Hughes, H. M. "Moral Evil," pp. 211-212; 214; "The Will," pp. 241-243; "Moral Sanctions," p. 308. *Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (1928).

The pages cited above are the sections devoted specifically to the Apocalypse of Abraham as a part of the full discussion of the topics listed here.

Goldin, Hyman E. "The Death of Abraham." *The Book of Legends*, 1 (1929): 142-148.

Kohler, Kaufmann. *Origins* (1929), pp. 180-184.

Kohler makes no distinction between the *Testament* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. Cf. his article: "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada: The Apocalypse of Abraham and Its Kindred." *JQR*, o.s., 7 (1894-95): 581-606.

Mangenot, E. "Apocalypses Apocryphes.--VI. Apocalypse d'Abraham." *DThC*, I,2 (1930): col. 1489.

Volz, Paul. "Die Abrahamapokalypse." *Eschatologie*^{2} (1934), pp. 48-49.

Buttenwieser, Moses. "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *UJE* 1 (1934): 38.

Scholem, G. G. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. (Jewish Institute of Religion, New York City.--The Hilda Stich Stroock Lectures, 1938.) Jerusalem: Schocken Publishing House, 1941, pp. 67-68.

Lods, Adolphe. "Apocalypse d'Abraham." *Histoire de la Littérature* (1950), pp. 944-945.

Rubinstein, Arie. "Hebraisms in the (Slavonic) 'Apocalypse of Abraham.'" *JJS*, 5 (1954): 132-135.

Puech, H. Ch.--Quispel, G.--van Unnik, W. C. *The Jung Codex. A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus. Three Studies*. Tran. and edited by F. L. Cross. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited/New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1955. See G. Quispel, "The Jung Codex and Its Significance," pp. 37-78; on the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, especially, pp. 70-72.

Bentzen, Aage. "The Apocalypse of Abraham." *Introduction to OT*^{3} 2 (1957): 250.

Meyer, Rudolf. "Abraham-Apokalypse," *RGG*^{3}, 1 (1957): col. 72.

Rubinstein, Arie. "A Problematic Passage in the Apocalypse of Abraham." *JJS*, 8 (1957): 45-50.
Rubinstein deals here with "the striking fact that Abraham is *not* satisfied with God's answer" and proceeds to pose a second question; he concludes that the second question (which seemingly goes unanswered) and the first paragraph of ch. XXIV must be directly related or "a later interpolation." This answer, he suggests, "does less than justice to the peculiar dualism of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*" (p. 50).

Bamberger, B. J. "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *IDB*, 1 (1962): 21.

Rowley, H. H. "The Apocalypse of Abraham." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 126-128.

"Abraham, Apocalypse of." *EJR* (1966), p. 4.

Rappoport, A. S. "The Death of the Patriarch." *Myth and Legend of Ancient Israel*, 1 (1966): 323-336.

Riessler, Paul. "Apokalypse des Abraham." *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*^{2} (1966), pp. 13-39; 1267-1269.

Schreiner, Josef. "Die Abrahamapokalypse." *Apokalyptik* (1969), pp. 68-70.

Brandon, S. G. F. "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *DCR* (1970), pp. 22-23.

THE TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM

James, M. R. *The Testament of Abraham, The Greek Text Now First Edited with an Introduction and Notes. With an Appendix Containing Extracts from the Arabic Version of The Testaments of Abraham, Isaac, and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature*, Edited by J. Armitage Robinson. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1892.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada (The Apocalypse of Abraham and Its Kindred)." *JQR*, o.s., 7 (1894-95): 581-606.

Kohler seems to equate the *Testament* with the *Apocalypse of Abraham*; the article dwells on the *Testament*.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Abraham, Testament of." *JE* 1 (1901): 93-96.

Ginzberg, L. *Legends* 1 (1909): 299-306; 5 (1925): 266-267.

Badham, F. P. "The Title 'Son of Man'." *ThT* 45 (1911): 395-448. See esp. pp. 445-446.

Badham suggests that John 5:27 has "an exact parallel" in the *Testament of Abraham* in the passage which reads: "Seest thou the terrible Man ... judged by his son." (See p. 92 of James's translation cited above.)

Kohler, Kaufmann. "Gehenna and Paradise in the Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament." *Heaven and Hell* (1923), pp. 59-80, passim. (See esp. pp. 77-80.)

Riessler, Paul. "Das Testament Abrahams. Ein jüdisches Apokryphon." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 106 (Tübingen, 1925): 3-22.

The Testament of Abraham. Translated by W. A. Craigie, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. IX, 5th edition, edited by Allan Menzies. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926, pp. 183-201.

Box, G. H. *The Testament of Abraham. Translated From the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. With an

Appendix Containing a Translation From the Coptic Version of the Testaments of Isaac and Jacob, by S. Gaselee. Translations of Early Documents. Series II: Hellenistic-Jewish Texts. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge/New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Frey, J.-B. "Abraham (Testament d')." *DBS* 1 (1928): cols. 33-38.

Kohler, Kaufmann. *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church*. Edited with a Biographical Essay by H. G. Enelow. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929, pp. 180-184.

"Abraham, Testament of." *UJE* 1 (1939): 40.

Macurdy, G. H. "Platonic Orphism in the Testament of Abraham." *JBL* 61 (1942): 213-226.

Turner, Nigel. "The 'Testament of Abraham': Problems in Biblical Greek." *NTS* 1 (1954/55): 219-223.

Bentzen, Aage. "The Testament of Abraham." *Introduction to OT*^{3} 2 (1957): 250-251.

Meyer, Rudolf. "Abraham-Testament." *RGG*^{3} 1 (1957): col. 73.

Bamberger, B. J. "Abraham, Testament of." *IDB* 1 (1962): 21.

Rowley, H. H. "The Testament of Abraham." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 128-129.

"Abraham, Testament of." *EJR* (1966), p. 4.

Riessler, Paul. "Testament des Abraham." *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*^{2} (1966), pp. 1091-1003; 1332-1333.

Borsch, F. H. *Son of Man in Myth and History* (1967), pp. 169-170.

Borsch followed Box in his conclusion that this text is "a thoroughly Jewish (probably Jewish-Hellenistic) work." (p. 169)

Brandon, S. G. F. "Christianity: the Problem of Relating a Saviour God to a Jewish Eschatology." *The Judgment of the Dead* (1967), pp. 98-135. See esp.

pp. 122-126.

Schreiner, Josef. "Das Testament des Abraham." Apokalyptik (1969), pp. 70-72.

Brandon, S. G. F. "Abraham, Testament of." DCR (1970), p. 23.

Denis, Albert-Marie. "Le Testament d'Abraham." Pseudépigraphes Grecs (1970), pp. 31-39.

THE LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE. (VITA ADAE ET EVAE. APOCALYPSIS MOSIS)

Dillmann, von August. *Das christliche Adambuch des Morgenlandes. Aus dem Athiopischen mit Bemerkungen übersetzt*. Göttingen: Verlag der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung, 1853.

Hort, Fenton John Anthony. "Adam, Books of." *DCB*, 1 (1877): 34-39.

Meyer, W. *Vita Adae et Evae. Herausgegeben und erläutert*. München: Verlag d. k. Akademie, (at) F. Straub, 1879.

Decourdemanche, J.-A. "La Légende d'Adam chez les Musulmans." *RHR* 5 (1882): 371-379.

Malan, S. C. *The Book of Adam and Eve, also called, The Conflict of Adam and Eve With Satan, a Book of the Early Eastern Church, translated from the Ethiopic, With Notes from the Kufale, Talmud, Midrashim, and Other Eastern Works*. London: and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1882.

Dillmann, August. "Pseudepigraphen des A. T.: Adambücher." *RE*^{2} 12 (1883): 366-367.

Zockler, D. Otto. "Pseudepigraphische Weissagungen in Apokalypse-Form. 2. Die Hinaufnahme Moses." *Die Apokryphen des AT* (1891), pp. 437-439.

Conybeare, F. C. "On the Apocalypse of Moses." *JQR*, o.s., 7 (1894-95): 216-235.
The author gives a brief introductory note and a translation of the Armenian text.

Schürer, Emil. "The Lost Legendary Works. 1. Books of Adam." *History*, 3 (1896): 146-148; *Geschichte*, 3 (1909): 395-399.

Fuchs, C. "Das Leben Adams und Evas." *APAT* 2 (1900): 506-528.

Preuschen, Erwin. *Die Apokryphen Gnostischen Adamschriften aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und untersucht*.

Giessen: J. Richer'sche Verlagsbuchhandung (Alfred Töpelmann), 1900.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Adam, Book of." *JE* 1 (1901): 179-180.

Tennant, F. R. "The Fall and Original Sin in Jewish Pseudepigraphic Literature: VI. *The Books of Adam*." *Sources* (1903), pp. 195-202.

Beer, Georg. "Adambücher." *RE*^{3} 16 (1905): cols. 263-264.

James, M. R. "Adam"; "The Death of Adam and Eve." *OT Legends* (1913), pp. 3-14; 17-24.

Wells, L. S. A. "The Books of Adam and Eve." Charles, *APOT* 2 (1913): 123-154.

James, M. R. *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Their Titles and Fragments; Collected, Translated and Discussed*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge/New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. (See esp. pp. 1-8.)

Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends*, 1 (1909): 86-107; 5 (1925): 114-135.

Badham, F. P. "The Title 'Son of Man'." *ThT* 45 (1911): 395-448. Badham suggests a possible parallel to the Gospel idea of renewal of all things in the *Apocalypsis Mosis*.xxviii.4; xxxix.2. Cf. the Armenian version (F. C. Conybeare's translation, *JQR*, o.s., 7 (1895): 216-235), which speaks of "thy primal glory" and "the day of the great renewal."

Beer, Georg. "The Books of Adam." *NSHE* 9 (1911): 341-342.

Ferrar, W. J. "Adam and Eve." *Uncanonical Jewish Books* (1918), pp. 63-65.

Frey, J.-B. "Adam (Livres Apocryphes sous Son Nom)." *DBS* 1 (1928), cols. 101-134. See esp. cols. 102-106: "La Vie d'Adam et d'Eve et l'Apocalypse de Moise."

Mozley, J. H. "The 'Vita Adae'." *JThS* 30 (1928-29): 121-149. * The author gives an introduction to the Latin text; valuable only as a textual study in the Latin text.

Mangenot, E. "Apocalypses Chrétiennes.--III. Apocalypse de Moïse." *DThC*, I, 2 (1930): col. 1493.

Volz, Paul. "Das Leben des Adam und der Eva. *Eschatologie*^{2} (1934), p. 49.

Buttenwieser, Moses. "Adam, Books of." *UJE* 1 (1939): 78-80.

Torrey, C. C. "The Book of Adam and Eve." *Apocryphal Literature* (1945), pp. 131-133.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *History of NT Times* (1949), pp. 72-73.

Lods, Adolphe. "La Vie d'Adam et d'Eve." *Histoire de la Littérature* (1950), pp. 923-926.
Lods discusses this topic under a broader sectional heading: "Judaïsme Palestinien: La Haggada."

Bentzen, Aage. "The Life of Adam and Eve." *Introduction to OT*^{3}, 2 (1957): 249-250.

Waxman, Meyer. "The Minor Apocalyptic Works: (2) 'The Book of Adam and Eve'." *History of Jewish Literature*, 1 (1960): 42-43.

Weiser, Artur. "The Life of Adam and Eve (Vita Adae et Evae. Apocalypsis Mosis)." *Old Testamant: Formation and Development* (1961), pp. 445-447.

Bamberger, B. J. "Adam, Books of." *IDB* 1 (1962): 44-45.

Quinn, E. C. *The Quest of Seth For the Oil of Life*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.
Quinn traces the legend which is a central feature of the Jewish psuedepigraphal work.

Rowley, H. H. "The Life of Adam and Eve." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 113-114.

Böhlig, A. "Die Adamapokalypse aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi als Zeugnis jüdisch-iranischer Gnosis." *Oriens Christianus* 48 (Wiesbaden, 1964): 44-49.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Life of Adam and Eve (Vita Adae et Evae. Apocalypsis Mosis)." *OT--Introduction* (1965), pp. 636-637.

MacRae, George W. "The Coptic Gnostic Apocalypse of Adam."

HeyJ 6 (1965): 27-35.

Quinn, E. C. "The Quest of Seth, Solomon's Ship and the Grail." Traditio. Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought and Religion 21 (New York, 1965): 185-222.

"Adam and Eve, Book of." EJR (1966), p. 12.

Riessler, Paul. "Apokalypse des Moses. Adam und Eva." Altjüdisches Schrifttum^2 (1966), pp. 128-155; 1273-74.

________. "Leben Adams und Evas." Ibid., pp. 668-681; 1311-12.

Stone, Michael. "The Death of Adam--An Armenian Adam Book." HThR 59 (1966): 283-291.

Stone gives the text and comments. He indicates that Preuschen's German translation of 1900 (see above) is of the same book.

Cardona, G. R. "Sur le Gnosticisme en Arménie: Les Livres d'Adam." Studies in the History of Religion; Supplements to Numen, 12: The Origins of Gnosticism. Colloquium of Messina, 13-18 April 1966. Texts and Discussions Published by Ugo Bianchi. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967, pp. 645-648.

Kasser, Rodolphe. "Apocalypse d'Adam." Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie, 3rd Series, 17 (Laussanne, 1967): 316-333.

The author gives a short introduction to the work and a translation of the text in French.

Schreiner, Josef. "Das Leben Adams und Evas (Vita Adae et Evae und Apokalypsis Mosis)." Apokalyptik (1969), pp. 52-54.

Borsch, F. H. Son of Man in Myth and History (1967), pp. 167-173; 200.

Borsch suggests, in view of the lustration type of "penance" endured by Adam and Eve, that "some manner of rite may be affecting this presentation of Adam," even though there is no evidence of any liturgical usage of these texts.

Fiedler, Martin Johannes. "Δικαιοσύνη in der diasporajüdischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur." JSJ 1 (1970): 120-143. See esp. Section 2. "Die

palästina-jüdischen Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen," pp. 134-142.

Denis, Albert-Marie. "L'Apocalypse de Moïse (=Vie d'Adam et Ève) et le Cycle d'Adam." *Pseudépigraphes Grecs* (1970), pp. 3-14.

Sharpe, J. *The Apocalypse of Moses*. In series: *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha*, edited by A. M. Denis and M. deJonge. Leiden: E. J. Brill. [In preparation.]

THE GREEK APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH (=III BARUCH)

Bonwetsch, Nathanael. "Das slavisch erhaltene Baruchbuch." *Nachrichten der Akademie* (bis 1940: *von der Gesellschaft*) *der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, (1896), 91-101.

James, M. R. *Apocrypha Anecdot II*. Texts and Studies, Vol. 5, No. 1. Cambridge: University Press, 1897. See esp. pp. LI-LXXI, 83-102.

Ryssell, V. "Die griechische Baruchapokalypse." *APAT*, 2 (1900): 446-452.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Baruch, Apocalypse of (Greek)." *JE* 2 (1902): 549-551.

Tennant, F. R. "The Fall and Original Sin in Jewish Pseudepigraphic Literature: VII. *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch*." *Sources* (1903), pp. 202-203.

Beer, Georg. *RE*^{3} 16 (1905): 251.

________. "Baruch Apocalypses." *NSHE* 9 (1911): 338.

Lüdtke, Wilhelm. "Beiträge zu slavischen Apokryphen." *ZAW* 21 (1911): 218-235. (Esp. pp. 219-222.)

Hughes, H. Maldwyn. "3 Baruch, or The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch." Charles, *APOT* 2 (1913): 527-541.

James, M. R. "Notes on Apocrypha." *JThS* 16 (1915): 403-413. (Esp. pp. 410-413.)

Ferrar, W. J. "The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (III. Baruch)." *Uncanonical Jewish Books* (1918), pp. 92-93.

Fuchs, Hugo. "Baruch, Apocalypse of." *UJE* 2 (1940): 96.
Regarding the Greek Baruch Apocalypse, Fuchs states simply (without citing examples) that "the Christian views are probably later interpolations." He notes too that some scholars (again he omits any specific references) feel that "the whole work is of Christian origin."

Lods, Adolphe. "L'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch et les autres ecrits se rapportant a Baruch." *Histoire de la Littérature* (1950), pp. 998-1005.

Klausner, Joseph. "The Greek Book of Baruch." *Messianic Idea in Israel* (1955), p. 382.

Weber-Ostwalden, Wilhelm. "Versuch einer Erklärung und Sinndeutung der griechischen Baruch-Apocalypse." Diss. theol. (Masch.) Graz, 1956.

Bentzen, Aage. "The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch." *Introduction to OT*^{3}, 2 (1957): 248-249.

Werbeck, W. "Baruchschriften, apokryphe." *RGG*^{3} 1 (1957): cols. 900-903.

Weiser, Artur. "The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch." *Old Testament: Formation and Development* (1961), pp. 440-442.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch." *OT--Introduction* (1965), pp. 630-631.

"Baruch, Book of." *EJR* (1966), p. 58.

The author briefly comments on the several pseudepigraphal works purporting to be from Baruch. He notes "a marked gnostic influence in the Greek Apocalypse."

Riessler, Paul. "Apokalypse des Baruch (griechisch)." *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*^{2} (1966), pp. 40-54; 1269-70.

Picard, J.-C. *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, in Vol. II: *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece*, edited by A. M. Denis and M. deJong. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967, pp. 61-96.

Picard gives the Greek text (pp. 81-96), after a brief but thorough introduction to the Greek Apocalypse (pp. 63-79). Of special interest is "The Problem of Christian Interpolations," pp. 75-78, in which the author briefly discusses the approaches to the two passages which scholars have unanimously labelled as Christian interpolations: ch. IV and chs. XI-XVII. Picard himself is convinced of "the original and thoroughly Jewish character" of chs. XI-XVII. (In this conclusion he sides with Ginzberg, *JE* 2 (1902): 549-551.

Denis, Albert-Marie. "L'Apocalypse grecque de Baruch." *Pseudépigraphes Grecs* (1970), pp. 79-84.

I ENOCH (=ETHIOPIC ENOCH)

Laurence, Richard. *The Book of Enoch the Prophet: An Apocryphal Production, Supposed for Ages to Have Been Lost; But Discovered at the Close of the Last Century in Abyssinia; Now First Translated From an Ethiopic Ms. in the Bodleian Library*. Oxford: Printed by S. Collingwood for John Henry Parker, sold also by J. G. and F. Rivington, London, 1821. (A second edition appeared in 1833; 3rd edition, 1838.)

Murray, Edward. *Enoch Restitutus; or, An Attempt to Separate from the Books of Enoch the Book Quoted by St. Jude; also, A Comparison of the Chronology of Enoch with the Hebrew Computation, and With the Periods Mentioned in the Book of Daniel and in the Apocalypse*. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1836.

Ewald, Georg Heinrich August. *Ueber das Zeitalter des Buches Henoch*. Halle, 1852. (Extr.: Allg. Monatsschr. f. Wiss. und Lit., 1852.)

Hofmann, J. Chr. K. von. "Ueber die Entstehungszeit des Buch Henoch." *ZDMG*, VI (1852), 87-91.

Lücke, F. "Das Buch Henoch." *Einleitung*^{2} (1852), pp. 89-144.

Dillmann, A. *Das Buch Henoch. Uebersetzt und Erklärt*. Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1853.

Ewald, Georg Heinrich August. *Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henokh Entstehung, Sinn, und Zusammensetzung*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1854. (Repr.: Königliche Gesellschaft der Wiss. z. Göttingen. Abhandlungen. Bd. 6.)

Kostlin. "Ueber die Entstehung des Buchs Henoch." *ThJb(T)* 15 (1856): 257.

Hilgenfeld, A. "Das Buch Henoch." *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (1857), pp. 91-184.

Dillmann, A. "Pseudepigraphen des A. T." *RE*^{1} 12 (1860): 308-310.

Hilgenfeld, A. "Die jüdische Apokalyptik und die neuesten Forschungen. 3. Das Buch Henoch." ZWTh 3 (1860): 319-334.

Volkmar. "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Henoch nach den äthiopischen Text." ZDMG 14 (1860): 87-134.

Hilgenfeld, A. "Die Entstehungszeit des ursprünglichen Buchs Henoch." ZWTh 4 (1861): 212-222.

Volkmar, Gustav. "Einige Bemerkungen über Apokalyptik, über Esra IV und Henoch im Besondern." ZWTh 4 (1861): 83-92; 111-136.

________. "Ueber die katholischen Briefe und Henoch." ZWTh 4 (1861): 422-436; 5 (1862): 46-75.

Hilgenfeld, A. "Noch ein Wort über das Buch Henoch." ZWTh 5 (1862): 216-221.

Volkmar, Gustav. Eine neutestamentliche Entdeckung und deren Bestreitung; oder die Geschichts-Vision des Buches Henoch im Zusammenhang. Zurich: E. Kiesling, 1862.

Philippi. Ferdinand. Das Buch Henoch, sein Zeitalter und sein Verhältniss zum Judasbriefe. Stuttgart: Verlag von S. G. Liesching, 1868.

As the title indicates, Philippi tried to show that Enoch was an original Christian document written to legitimatize the canonization of the Jude Epistle.

Vernes, Maurice. Histoire des Idées Messianiques depuis Alexandre jusqu'a l'empereur Hadrien. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher, 1874, pp. 69-117; 264-270.

Vernes regards the messianism of the Similitudes as Christian and dates them at the end of the first century A.D.

Tideman, B. "De Apocalypse van Henoch en het Essenisme." ThT 9 (1875): 261-368.

Drummond, James. "The Book of Enoch." The Jewish Messiah (1877), pp. 17-73, and passim.

________. "Titles and Names of the Messiah (in the Book of Enoch)." The Jewish Messiah (1877), p. 284.

Bissell. "The Book of Enoch." Apocrypha--OT (1880), pp.

665-666.

Lipsius, Richard A. "Enoch, Apocryphal Book of." *DCB* 2 (1880): 124-128.

Schodde, George H. *The Book of Enoch: Translated from the Ethiopic with Introduction and Notes*. Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1882.

Dillmann, A. "Pseudepigraphen des A.T." *RE*^{2} 12 (1883): 341-367. On Enoch see esp. pp. 350-352.

Redford, Robert A. "Growth of the Messianic Expectation." *Four Centuries of Silence; or, From Malachi to Christ*. Chicago: Jansen McClurg & Co., 1885, pp. 145-168. I Enoch, esp. pp. 153-159.

Stanton, V. H. *The Jewish and Christian Messiah* (1886), pp. 44-64.

________. "Christology of the Enochic Book of the Three Parables." *The Jewish and Christian Messiah* (1886), pp. 170-175.

________. "Note on Volkmar's Theory of Date and Vision of Seventy Shepherds in Book of Enoch." *The Jewish and Christian Messiah* (1886), pp. 88-95.

Deane, William J. "The Book of Enoch." *Pseudepigrapha* (1891), pp. 49-95.

Sanday, W. "On the Title, 'Son of Man'." *Exp*, 4th Series, 3 (1891): 18-32. On the "Similitudes" see esp. pp. 27ff.; cf. articles by Sanford, *JR* 3 (1923): 308-313, and Patton, *JR* 2 (1922): 501-511.

Thomson, John H. "The Enoch Books"; "The Book of Enoch: Its Date and Language." *Books Which Influenced Our Lord* (1891), pp. 225-248; 389-411.

Zöckler, D. Otto. "Pseudepigraphische Weissagungen in Apokalypse-Form. 1. Das Buch Henoch." *Die Apokryphen des AT* (1891), pp. 426-437.

Charles, R. H. "The Ethiopic Manuscripts of Enoch in the British Museum." *ET* 3 (1891-92): 135.

Charles says that the MSS in the British Museum are superior to all MSS previously known. This (1) "lowers the scientific value of Dillmann's Ethiopic text," and (2) "renders a new edition a growing desideratum."

Lods, A. *Le Livre d'Hénoch. Fragments grecs découverts à Akhmîm (Haute-Égypte) publiés avec les variantes du texte ethiopien traduits et annoteé*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1892.

Charles, R. H. "Messianic Doctrine of the Book of Enoch and Its Influence on the New Testament." *ET* 4 (1892-93): 301-303. See R.T.H.'s examination of Charles's position in article cited below.

Faye, Eugene de. A Review of Adolphe Lods, *Le livre d'Hénoch*. [A Review Article]. *RHR* 27 (1893): 78-82.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch, Translated from Professor Dillmann's Ethiopic Text, Emended and Revised in Accordance with Hitherto Uncollated Ethiopic MSS. and With the Gizeh and Other Greek and Latin Fragments Which are Here Published in Full, Edited With Introduction, Notes, Appendices, and Indices*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1893. A second edition, 1912.

For a brief review of this volume, see *ET* 18 (1906-07): 269-270. Significant here too is: Kohler, Kaufmann. "The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature." *JQR*, n.s., 11 (1920-21); 145-168. Kohler is quite critical of the approach taken by Charles in both his *I Enoch* (1893) and his *Eschatology* (1913).

Thomson, John H. "The Enoch Books." *IJA*, xxxvi (April, 1914): 32-34.

Thomson's major concern in this brief note is a review of Charles's volume mentioned above.

R., T. H. [No name given; initials only.] "The Book of Enoch and the New Testament." *BW*, n.s., 1 (1893): 468-469.

An examination of R. H. Charles's conclusion that the "Son of Man" concept in the Gospels came from Enoch, *ET* 4 (1892-93): 301-303. This author prefers Dan. 7 as "the ultimate source of the designation."

Schodde, George H. "The New Greek Enoch Fragments." *BW*, n.s., 1 (1893): 359-362.

Schodde reports a new find of the first 32 chapters in Greek; i.e., 16 pp. in Dillmann's German translation. The Syncellus text contained only vi.1-

x.14 and xv.8 to svi.; i.e., 31/4 pp. of Dillmann's translation.

Beet, Joseph Agar. "New Testament Teaching on the Second Coming of Christ: 1. Preparatory: The Old Testament and the Book of Enoch." Exp, 4th Series, 9 (1894), 430-439.

Büchler, A. "Das Zehnstämmereich in der Geschichtsvision des Henochbuches." MGWJ 39 (1895): 11-23.

Robert, Abbé. "Les Fils de Dieu et les Filles de l'Homme.--Exposé des faits; le texte de la Genèse, l'opinion des Pères, le livre d'Hénoch." RB, o.s., 4 (1895): 340-373; 525-552. See esp. pp. 366-373; 539-546.

In the sections cited specifically, the author deals briefly with "La chute des Anges et l'origine des géants," I Enoch vi. 1-8; vii. 1-6; viii. 1-4; ix. 1-5.

Schmidt, Nathaniel. "Was בר נשא a Messianic Title?" JBL 15 (1896): 36-53.

Schürer, Emil. "The Book of Enoch." History, 3 (1896): 54-73; Geschichte, 3 (1909): 268-290.

Selbie, J. A. "Bruston on 'Christ's Descent to Hell'." A review of La Descente du Christ aux Enfers, d'apres les Apotres et d'apres l'Eglise by C. Bruston, Paris, 1877. ET 9 (1897-98): 20-22. Takes into account Enoch 6-16.

Clemen, C. "Die Zusammensetzung des Buches Henoch, der Apokalypse des Baruch, und des vierten Buches Esra." ThStKr 71 (1898): 211-246.

Hayman, Henry. "The Book of Enoch in Reference to the New Testament and Early Christian Antiquity." BW, n.s., 12 (1898): 37-46.

Mathews, Shailer. "The Jewish Messianic Expectation in the Time of Jesus." BW, n.s., 12 (1898): 437-443.

The author cites passages from the pseudepigraphal materials (i.e., Enoch 46:1-6; 51:1-3; 62:2; 69:27-29; 90:37-38; Siby. Oracles 3:776-784; 5:332-335; 3:55-60; and others) with very little comment. The article offers very little help to the reader. From the format of the article, it appears that Mathew's sole purpose was to suggest certain literary expressions of a messianic expectation.

Buchwaldt, N. A. "Et graesk fragment af Enochs Bog." *Theologisk Tidsskrift for den Danske Folkekirke*, 14 (Kopenhagen, 1899): 48-85.

Swete, H. B. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1899, pp. 789-809.

Wellhausen, J. "Des Menschen Sohn." *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*. Sechstes Heft. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1899. pp. 187-215.

Beer, G. "Das Buch Henoch." *APAT*, 2 (1900): 217-310.

Flemming, J.--Radermacher, L. *Das Buch Henoch: griechisches Fragment und deutsche Übersetzung des äthiopischen Textes*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1901. See the following reviews: Th. Calmes, *RB*, o.s., 10 (1901): 621-622; R. H. Charles, *JThS* 4 (1902-03): 614-617.

Harris, J. Rendel. "An Unobserved Quotation from the Book of Enoch [Enoch i.2]"; "A Further Note on the Use of Enoch in I Peter." *Exp*, 6th Series, 4 (1901): 194-199; 346-349.

Harris suggests that the word 'Ενώχ has dropped out of I Peter 3:19; cf. Enoch xii.

Barton, G. A. "On the Jewish-Christian Doctrine of the Preexistence of the Messiah." *JBL* 21 (1902): 78-91.

The author focuses on I Enoch 46:1ff. and 48:3ff. See especially pp. 78-81.

Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus. Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Trans. by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902. See especially these sections: "The Son of Man," pp. 234-267; "Christ," pp. 289-316.

Loon, J. van. "Eschatologieën van den Hasmoneëntijd volgens het boek Henock." *ThT* 36 (1902): 421-463.

Charles, R. H. "The Book of Enoch." *JThS* 4 (1902-03): 614-617.

In this brief article Charles reviews the work on Enoch by Flemming and Radermacher.

Dods, Marcus. "The Books of Enoch." *Forerunners of Dante*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903, pp. 117-126. On

Ethiopic Enoch, see esp. pp. 117-120; cf. "The 'Descensus Christi'," pp. 83-100, passim.

Littmann, Enno. "Enoch, Books of (Ethiopic and Slavonic)." *JE* 5 (1903): 179-182.

Tennant, F. R. "The Fall and Original Sin in Jewish Pseudepigraphic Literature: I. *The (Aethiopic) Book of Enoch*." *Sources* (1903), pp. 181-190.

Bevan, Edwyn. *Jerusalem Under the High-Priests, Five Lectures on the Period Between Nehemiah and the New Testament*. London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1904, pp. 118-120; 130-131; 158-162.

In the first reference Bevan tries to set Enoch within the historical setting that helps to create this type of apocalyptic literature; the second reference dwells on the *Similitudes*. Bevan says they were "read and loved" in the early Christian Church, although they were not written as a Christian would have written them!

Beer, Georg. *RE*^{3} 16 (1905): 237-242.

Gressmann, Hugo. "Der 'Mensch' im Henochbuche." *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905, pp. 355-365.

Gry, Léon. "Le Roi-Messie dans Hénoch (parties anciennes)." *Muséon*, n.s., 6 (1905): 129-139.

Muirhead, Lewis A. *The Times of Christ*. New Addition with Some Alterations and Additions. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905. See especially: "The Messianic Hope," pp. 112-150, passim. I Enoch, chs. 83-90, especially pp. 138-150.

Porter, Frank Chamberlin. "The Book of Enoch." *The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905, pp. 299-329.

Appel, H. *Die Komposition des äthiopischen Henochbuches*. Vol. 10 of: *Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie*. Various editors. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1906.

Martin, François. *Le Livre d'Hénoch*. In: *Documents pour l'étude de la Bible*. Edited by Francois Martin. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, Éditeurs, 1906.

See the review by Lagrange, *RB* 3 (1906): 621-624.

Strack, Hermann. "Das (äthiopische) Henoch-Buch." *Einleitung AT*^{2} (1906), pp. 176-177.

Strack labels I Enoch, along with 4 Ezra and the Testaments of the 12, as "prophetische pseudepigraphen."

Burkitt, F. C. "Four Notes on the Book of Enoch." *JThS* 8 (1906-07): 444-447.

Burkitt focuses on Enoch xxii.3, xxiii.9ff., and xxxvii-lxx.

Reid, George J. "The Book of Henoch (Ethiopic)." *CathEnc* 1 (1907): 602-603.

Gry, Leon. "Le Messianisme des Paraboles d'Henoch." *Museon* 9 (1908): 318-367.

Schmidt, Nathaniel. "The Original Language of the Parables of Enoch." *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*. Vol. 2. Edited by R. F. Harper, Francis Brown, and George Foot Moore. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908, pp. 327-350.

Schmidt concludes that the original language was Aramaic. See the review note on this article by L. Gry in *RB* 6 (1909): 462-464.

Sanday, W. "The Bearing of Criticism Upon the Gospel History." *ET* 20 (1908-09): 152-162.

The author deals specifically with the conceptions of Messiah and Son of Man; brief reference is made to the Similitudes of Enoch, p. 160, where the writer concludes that "the most prominent function of the Son of Man in the similitudes in the Book of Enoch is judgment."

Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends*. 1 (1909): 145-140; 5 (1925): 153-164.

Gry, Léon. "Quand furent composées les Paraboles d'Hénoch?" *Museon* 10 (1909): 103-141.

Gry, Léon. "Le messianisme des Paraboles d'Hénoch et la théologie juive contempóraine." *Muséon* 10 (1909): 143-154.

Wicher, Edward A. "Ancient Jewish Views of the Messiah." *BW*, n.s., 34 (1909): 317-325; 404-409.

Wicher contends that "actual pre-existence" is taught in Enoch (p. 319). He concludes that there is no element in Jesus' messianic thinking "that cannot be paralleled somewhere in Jewish literature" (p. 409); the unique element is Jesus' use of the suffering servant motif "which was almost wholly ignored by his contemporaries" (p. 409).

James, M. R. "Names of Angels in Anglo-Saxon and Other Documents." *JThS* 11 (1909-10): 569-571.
James concludes that the Book of Enoch (especially ch. 20) may have been "a factor in determining the list of the seven archangels" (p. 571.)

Abbott, E. A. "'Son of Man' in Pre-Christian Usage." *Son of Man* (1910), pp. 23-118. On the Similitudes see esp. pp. 50-57.

Coulange, Louis. "L'Idée Messianique." *RHLR* 13 (1910): 131-143, passim.

Gry, Leon. *Les Paraboles d'Hénoch et leur messianisme*. Paris: Picard et Fils, 1910.

Badham, F. P. "The Title 'Son of Man'." *ThT* 45 (1911): 395-448.

Beer, Georg. "The Ethiopic Enoch." *NSHE* 9 (1911): 335-336.

Charles, R. H. "Enoch, (Ethiopic) Book of." *DB(H)* 1 (1911): 705-708.

Wells, L. S. A. "The Historical Succession of the Books of Enoch." *IJA* xxiii (October, 1910): 72-76; xxiv (January, 1911): 10-15.

Barton, G. A. "The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 A.D." *JBL* 31 (1912): 156-167.
The writer sees a definite distinction between those who connect evil spirits with the account of Genesis 6:2-4 (e.g., I Enoch) and others who connected them more closely to the "sinful tendencies of men" (e.g., *The Testaments of the Twelve* and the *Ascension of Isaiah*). Cf. especially pp. 159-161.

Box, G. H. "The Christian Messiah in the Light of Judaism Ancient and Modern." *JThS* 13 (1912): 321-338.

Leszynsky, R. "Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen: 3. Das Henochbuch." *Die Sadduzäer* (1912), pp. 253-266.

Gry, Léon. "La dénomination messianique 'Fils de l'Homme' dans la Bible et les Apocryphes éthiopiens." *ΞΕΝΙΑ Hommage international a l'universite nationale de Grece, a l'occasion du soixante-quinzieme anniversaire de sa fondation (1837-1912)*. Athenes: Imprimerie "Hestia," 1912, pp. I-XI.

Gry concludes that the Ethiopic translation is very faithful to the Aramaic.

Charles, R. H. "I Enoch." *APOT* 2 (1913): 163-277.

________. *Eschatology*. (1913).

"I Enoch vi.-xxxvi. (probably before 170 B.C.)", pp. 213-220.

"I Enoch lxxxiii.-xc. (166-161 B.C.)", pp. 220-223.

"I Enoch xci.-civ. (134-95, or more nearly 104-95 B.C.)," pp. 250-259.

"I Enoch xxxvii.-lxxi. (94-64 B.C.)," pp. 260-266.

________. *Religious Development* (1914), pp. 223-226; 231-238.

Burkitt, F. C. Apocalypses (1914). "The Book of Enoch." pp. 17-33. "On the Greek Text of Enoch." pp. 53-71.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Book of Enoch." *Books of the Apocrypha* (1914), pp. 201-208.

Thomson, John E. H. "The Enoch Books." *IJA* xxxvii (April, 1914): 32-34.

A brief examination of R. H. Charles's volume on Enoch.

Weidner, E. F. "Babylonisches im Buch Henoch." *OLZ* 19 (1916): 74-75.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch*. With an Introduction by W. O. E. Oesterley. Translations of Early Documents. Series I: Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic). London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

Prideaux, S. P. T. "The New Testament in the Light of the Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. IJA li (October, 1917): 56-58

Prideaux suggests that the term 'Son of Man' can be understood only against the background of Enoch.

Ferrar, W. J. "I. Enoch." Uncanonical Jewish Books (1918), pp. 68-72.

Bentwich, Norman. "The Hellenistic-Jewish Literature." Hellenism. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1919, pp. 197-245. Esp. pp. 227-233.

Schmidt, Nathaniel. "Traces of Early Acquaintance in Europe With the Book of Enoch." JAOS 42 (1920): 44-52.

Kuhn, G. "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Henoch." ZAW 39 (1921): 240-275.

Messel, Nils. Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch. BZAW 35. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1922.

Patton, Carl. "Did Jesus Call Himself the Son of Man?" JR^2 (1922): 501-511.

Patton says no. Some instances where the title is used reflect "editorial observations" which have become a part of Jesus' conversation. Patton notes too that Matt. and Luke many times use the phrase where Mark does not. These "insertions" sometimes alter or spoil the original context. At other times the passages show evidence of a "later working over." Many times the phrase is "textually suspicious." Cf. Sanford's answer to Patton in JR 3 (1923): 308-313.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "Gehenna and Paradise in the Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament." Heaven and Hell (1923), pp. 59-80, passim. Esp. pp. 63-67.

Sanford, A. M. "Did Jesus Call Himself the Son of Man? Another Point of View." JR 3 (1923): 308-313.

In answer to Patton's article (JR 2 (1922): 501-511), Sanford says yes, and seeks the origin of the title in the OT rather than in Enoch (p. 311). "It seems fairly clear that Jesus adopted the title (which carries no messianic connotations in the Old Testament) because it suggested his complete oneness with humanity" (p. 311). Cf. Sanday's conclusion in *Exp*, 4th Series, 3 (1891): 18-32.

Welch, Adam C. "A Zealot Pamphlet." *Exp*, 8th Series, 25 (1923): 273-287.

Welch deals with "the Apocalypse of Weeks," 91:12-17; 93:1-14. He suggests the possibility of a new approach to Jesus--i.e., our traditional approach has been to try to find books that influenced him, etc. We may see here a book against whose views Jesus reacted. (Cf. J. P. Thorndike. "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Qumran Sect." *RdQ* 3 (1961): 163-184.)

Dupont, Georges. "Le Fils de l'Homme a la Fin du Judaïsme." *Le Fils de L'Homme: Essai Historique et Critique*. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1924, pp. 7-27. See esp. pp. 12-18: "Les Paraboles d'Henoch."

Dix, G. H. "The Heavenly Wisdom and the Divine Logos in Jewish Apocalyptic." *JThS* 26 (1924-25): 1-12.

See especially pp. 5-7, 9. The writer concludes that only the "wisdom" source is found in the Similitudes.

________. "The Influence of Babylonian Ideas on Jewish Messianism." *JThS* 26 (1924-25): 241-256, passim.

________. "The Enochic Pentateuch." *JThS* 27 (1925-26): 29-42.

Klausner, Joseph. *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching*. Trans. from the original Hebrew by Herbert Danby. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.

For a brief note on the use of "Son of Man" in Enoch, see pp. 256-257. Klausner sees the title as both messianic and of pre-Christian origin. In fact, this messianic significance may even be seen in the *Talmud* and the *Targum* (cf. footnote 20, p. 256). See the review of Klausner's volume by George Foot Moore: "A Jewish Life of Jesus." *HThR* 16 (1923): 93-103.

Pedersen, J. "Zur Erklärung der eschatologischen Visionen Henochs." *In Memoriam A. Fischer*. *Islamica*, Vol. 2. Lipsiae: In aedibus quae Asia Major appellantur, 1926-27, pp. 416-429.

Schmidt, Nathaniel. "The Apocalypse of Noah and the Parables of Enoch." *Oriental Studies Dedicated to Paul Haupt*.

Edited by C. Adler and A. Ember. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1926, pp. 111-123.

________. "Recent Study of the Term 'Son of Man'." JBL 45 (1926): 326-349, passim.
In this article, Schmidt does not deal specifically with Enoch, but generally with the idea of Son of Man.

Frey, J.-B. "Le Livre d'Hénoch." DBS 1 (1928): cols. 357-371.

Lods, Adolphe. "La Chute des Anges: Origine et Portée de cette Spéculation." Congrès d'Histoire du Christianisme: Jubilé Alfred Loisy. Publié sous la Direction de P.-L. Couchoud. 3 vols. Paris: Les Editions Rieder, 1928, vol. 1: pp. 29-54.

Booth, Henry K. "Messianic Prophecy Between the Testaments." The Bridge Between the Testaments: A Survey of the Life and Literature of the Period of the Connections. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929, pp. 189-200.
Booth sees a "transformation" in the idea of Messiah and subsequently in the idea of His Kingdom in Enoch's "Son of Man" passages (e.g., I Enoch 45, 46, 48, and 69). He points out several parallels with NT passages: I En. 71:10=Rev. 1:13-14; I En. 40:1=Rev. 5:11; I En. 91:16=Rev. 21:7.

Kohler, Kaufmann. The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church. The Kaufman Kohler Memorial Volume. Edited with a Biographical Essay by H. G. Enelow. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929, pp. 178-180.

Bentzen, A. "Quelques remarques sur le mouvement messianique parmi les Juifs aux Environs de l'An 520 avant Jesus-Christ." RHPhR 10 (1930): 493-503.

Kaplan, Chaim. "Angels in the Book of Enoch." AThR 12 (1930): 423-437.

________. "The Pharisaic Character and the Date of the Book of Enoch." AThR 12 (1930), 531-537.

________. "Constituent Parts of the Book of Enoch." RExp 27 (1930): 211-217.

Mangenot, E. "Apocalypses Juives.--I. Livres d'Hénoch.--1. Livre éthiopien." DThC, I, 2 (1930): cols. 1480-82.

Bindley, T. Herbert. "The Books of Enoch." *Religious Though in Palestine in the Time of Jesus.* London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1931, pp. 32-44.

Kaplan, Chaim. "The Angel of Peace, Uriel, Metatron (I Enoch 40. 8)." *AThR* 13(1931): 306-313.

________. "The Flood in the Book of Enoch and Rabbinics." *JSOR* 15 (1931): 22-24.

Lagrange, M.-J. *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (1931).

"Le Livre des paraboles d'Hénoch," pp. 242-258.

"L'origine et le developpement de la conception du grand Assistant," pp. 258-262.

"Le livre de la Sagesse d'Hénoch" (Enoch XLI-CV), pp. 263-266.

"L'Apocalyptique sous les premiers Asmonéens: Hénoch I-XXXVI. Le Péché et le jugement: Hénoch XCIII, 1-10 et XCI, 12-17. Les semaines: Hénoch LXXXIII-XC. Les songes," pp. 109-116.

Vitti, A. "Ultime critiche su Enoc stiopic." *Bib* 12 (1931): 316-325.

Box, G. H. "The Ethiopic Book of Enoch (I Enoch)." *Judaism in the Greek Period*. Vol. V of *The Clarendon Bible: Old Testament*. Edited by Herbert Wild and G. H. Box. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1932, pp. 219-222.

Brinkmann, B. "Die Lehre von der Parusie beim hl. Paulus und im Buche Henoch." *Bib* 13 (1932): 315-334; 445-461.

Herford, R. Travers. "The Book of Enoch." *Talmud and Apocrypha* (1933), pp. 211-221.

Jung, Leo. "Mis-Translation as Source in Jewish and Christian Lore." *PAAJR* 5 (1933-34): 55-67.

See especially Section II, "The 'Watchers' of Enoch." Jung thinks that "watchers" is due to a misunderderstanding of the Hebrew word *עיר* in Daniel and the same word in the Aramaic original of Enoch. The word is derived from Hebrew root ציר ("messenger, angel") and not the Hebrew and Aramaic root meaning to "be awake".

Kaplan, Chaim. "Versions and Readings in the Book of Enoch." *AJSL*, 50 (1933-34), 171-177.

Volz, Paul. "Das äthiopische Henochbuch." *Eschatologie*² (1934), pp. 18-25.

Kaupel, H. "Die Strafengel im Buche Henoch." *ThGl* 27 (1935): 186-195.

Manson, T. W. *The Teaching of Jesus*² (1935).

"God as King: The Final Consummation," pp. 244-284.

"The Son of Man," pp. 211-236. (See esp. pp. 228-229.) Manson sees the Gospel use of 'Son of Man' against the background of Daniel rather than Enoch.

Odeberg, H. "Henoch im Judentum." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 2 (1935): 553-555.

Stier, Fridolin. "Zur Komposition und Literaturkritik der Bilderreden des äthiopischen Henoch, Kap. 37-39." *Orientalische Studien, Enno Littmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag am 16. September 1935 überreicht von Schülern aus seiner Bonner und Tübinger Zeit*. Herausgegeben von R. Paret. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1935, pp. 70-88.

Kaplan, Chaim. "The Original Language of Enoch." *Horeb*, 2 (1935/6): 297-309.

Torrey, C. C. *Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1936, pp. xv-xxviii.

Here Torrey seeks to show that there is nothing new in the concepts of "Son of Man" and "The Elect One", but rather what has been taken for granted by all the Jews for two or three centuries past. (Cf. Torrey, *Apocryphal Literature* (1945), pp. 110-114.)

Bonner, Campbell. *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek*. *Studies and Documents 8*, edited by Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake. London: Christophers, 1937. (See the following reviews: W. L. Knox, *JThS* 39 (1938): 173-174; Ralph Marcus, *JBL* 59 (1940): 311-313.)

Gry, Léon. "Mystique gnostique (juive et chretienne) en finale des Paraboles d'Henoch." *Muséon* 52 (1939): 337-378.

Jansen, H. Ludin. *Die Henochgestalt. Eine Vergleichende Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Olso: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1939.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Beobachtungen zu neutestamentlichen Stellen an Hand des neugefundenen griechischen Henoch-Textes." *ZNW* 28 (1939): 115-124.

McColley, Grant. "The Book of Enoch and Paradise Lost." *HThR* 31 (1939): 21-39.

This article deals mainly with the *rapport* between Milton's *Paradise Lost* and *Enoch* and concludes that Milton and other mid-seventeenth century scholars "knew more of the Book of Enoch than might be obtained from the often slender fragments of New Testament, patristic, and rabbinic writers . . ." (p. 39).

Sjöberg, Erik. "Känner 1 Henok och 4 Esra tanken på den libande Människosonen?" Erling Eidem, s.s. theologiae doctoci, summo suo prasidi, sexagenario, pie ac reverenter obtulit hunc fasciculum societas exegetica upsaliensis. (*Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, V.) Uppsala: Wretmans boktryckeri A.-B., 1940, pp. 163-183.

Williams, Arnold. "Milton and the Book of Enoch--An Alternative Hypothesis." *HThR* 33 (1940): 291-299.

Fuchs, Hugo. "Enoch, Book of." *UJE* 4 (1941): 131-133.

Parker, Pierson. "The Meaning of 'Son of Man'." *JBL* 60 (1941): 151-157.

The author is concerned with the terms for 'Son of Man' used in I Enoch. He concludes that there seems to be no messianic connotations to the phrase outside the Gospels.

Zimmermann, Frank. "The Bilingual Character of I Enoch." *JBL* 60 (1941): 159-172.

Macurdy, G. H. "Platonic Orphism in the Testament of Abraham." *JBL* 61 (1942): 213-226, passim.

See especially p. 225 where the writer disagrees with James (in his treatment of the *Testament of Abraham*) that Enoch set the pattern for all later books which represent the seer as being conducted over unknown regions by angelic guides. Macurdy points rather to the writing of Plato.

Sjöberg, Erik. "Frågan om den lidande Människosonen i 1 Henok." *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 7 (Uppsala, 1942): 141-144.

Torrey, C. C. "Notes on the Greek Texts of Enoch." *JAOS* 62 (1942): 52-60.

Torrey examines passages from each major section of Enoch in an effort to show that Aramaic was the original language of "every portion of the book." (p. 53) Cf. the two articles by G. Zuntz cited below which deal with the same topic.

Zuntz, G. "Notes on the Greek Enoch." *JBL* 61 (1942): 193-204.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Henok og Menneskesonnen." *Norsk teologisk Tidsskrift* 45 (Olso, 1944): 57-69.

Zuntz, G. "Enoch on the Last Judgment (Ch. CII, 1-3)." *JThS* 45 (1944): 161-170.

Zuntz here is more concerned with textual problems rather than the theme of judgment in Enoch.

________. "The Greek Text of Enoch 102:1-3." *JBL* 63 (1944): 53-54.

Cf. Zuntz's earlier article, *JBL* 61 (1942): 193-204. This present article was written as a "reconsideration" after the thorough review of the problem by Torrey (see citation above, *JAOS* 62 52-60).

Torrey, C. C. "Enoch." *Apocryphal Literature* (1945), pp. 110-114.

Gry, Léon. "Hénoch X, 19 et Les Belles Promesses de Papias." *RB* 53 (1946): 197-206.

Glasson, T. Frances. *The Second Advent. The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*. London: The Epworth Press, 1945. See esp. pp. 56-62. (A new edition appeared in 1963.)

Glasson questions the pre-Christian date of the Similitudes and suggests the middle of the first century A.D. as more reasonable. Ladd says Glasson's reasoning "is not forceful". (Cf. Ladd's article: "The Kingdom of God in the Jewish Apocryphal Literature: I Enoch." *BS* 109 (1952): 55-62; 318-331; 110 (1953): 32-49.)

Sjöberg, Erik. *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946. (Cf. the following reviews: B. Metzger, *PTR* 43 (1950): 53-54; (1948): 79-84; J. Jeremias, *ThLZ* 74 (1949): cols. 405-406.)

Wallach, L. "A Jewish Polemic Against Gnosticism." *JBL* 65 (1946): 393-396.

The polemic is *Pirke Abot III, 9*, which cites Enoch 32:5.

Campbell, J. Y. "The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man." *JThS* 48 (1947): 145-155.

Campbell deals specifically with the Similitudes of Enoch and Daniel 7:13 and concludes that in Enoch the term is a later Christian interpolation.

Causse, Antonin. "De la Jérusalem terrestre à la Jérusalem céleste." *In Memoriam Antonin Causse*. (*Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, XXVII, no. 1-2.) Paris: Presses universitarires de France, 1947, pp. 12-36.

Deals chiefly with passages in Enoch and 4 Esdras. Cites: Enoch 14:15-24; 71:1-5; 103:9-12; etc.

Giblet, J. "L'Espérance de la justice messianique dans le Livre d'Hénoch." *Collectanea Mechliniensia* 32 N.S. 17 (Mechelen, 1947): 634-651.

Black, Matthew. "The Son of Man in the Old Biblical Literature." *ET* 60 (1948): 11-15. (Black follows this article with "The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus," same volume, pp. 32-36.)

Bowman, John. "The Background of the Term 'Son of Man'." *ET* 60 (1948): 283-288.

McCown, C. C. "Jesus, Son of Man: A Survey of Recent Discussion." *JR* 38 (1948): 1-12. (Especially significant for Enoch are pp. 6, 8-10.)

Peterson, E. "Henoch im jüdischen Gebet und in jüdischer Kunst." *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L. Cuniberti*

Mohlberg. (Portr. Bibl. "Ephemerides liturgicae," 22-.) Roma, 1948, vol. I: pp. 413-417.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. History of NT Times (1949), pp. 74-79.

Manson, T. W. "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels." BJRL 32 (1949-50): 171-193. Reprinted in: Manson, T. W. Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Edited by Matthew Black. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962, pp. 123-145.

Lods, Adolphe. Histoire de la Littérature (1950).

"Les Parties anciennes du Livre d'Hénoch (Hénoch Éthiopien)," pp. 856-876.

"Les Paraboles d'Hénoch," pp. 877-882.

Milik, J. T. "The Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of the Book of Enoch." Bib 22 (1951): 393-400.

Milik shows a "chain of tradition" from Noah to Levi. He suggests, too, the possibility that the "Book of Noah" may be the same as the "Apocalypse of Lamech."

"Libri di Henoch." Études et Commentaires 6 (Paris, 1951): 1405-08.

Rankin, O. S. "The Messianic Office in the Literature of Judaism and the New Testament." ZAW 63 n.f. 22 (1951), 259-270. (Esp. pp. 265-268.)

Black, Matthew. "Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch." JThS, n.s., 3 (1952): 1-10.

Frost, Stanley Brice. "Enoch, Books One and Four"; "Enoch, Books Five and Two." Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth. London: The Epworth Press, 1952, pp. 164-177; 210-230.

Ladd, George E. "The Kingdom of God in the Jewish Apocryphal Literature: I Enoch." BS 109 (1952): 318-331; 110 (1953): 32-49. (For Ladd's general introductory article, see BS 109 (1952): 55-62.)

Danielou, J. "Terre et Paradis chez les Pères de l'Église." Eranos-Jahrbuch, XXII (Zurich, 1954), 433-472. (See esp. pp. 433-437.)

Mowinckel, Sigmund. "The Son of Man." He That Cometh.

Trans. by G. W. Anderson. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954, pp. 346-450. See esp. Section 20, "Is Enoch the Son of Man?" pp. 437-444.

Torrey, C. C. "Alexander Jannaeus and the Archangel Michael." *VT* 4 (1954): 208-211. (Especially significant for chs. 85-90, the "Dream-Visions.")

Andel, C. P. van. *De Structure van de Henoch-traditie en het Nieuwe Testament; een onderzoek naar het milieu van apocalyptische en sectarische tradities binnen het jodendom in zijn relatie tot het milieu van het oer-christelijk kerugma*. (*Studia theologica rhenotraiectina*, Vol. 2.) Utrecht: Kemink, 1955. (A summary is provided in English, pp. 114-127.)

Klausner, Joseph. "The 'Ethiopic' Book of Enoch." *Messianic Idea in Israel* (1955), pp. 277-301.

Vogt, E. "Antiquum kalendarium sacerdotale." *Bib* 36 (1955): 403-408.

Bentzen, Aage. "Enoch." *Introduction to OT*^{3}, 2 (1957): 242-244.

Hadfield, P. "The Resurrection Body." *Church Quarterly Review* 158 (London, 1957): 296-305.

An interesting survey of the idea of resurrection from the OT to Pauline theology. See especially pp. 296-297 for the changing conceptions of resurrection in Enoch; the author sees ideas which are peculiar to the different sections of Enoch: 1-36, 83-90, 91-104.

Otto, Rudolf. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*. Trans. from the Revised German edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf. Boston: Starr King Press, 1957.

"The Son of Man and the Book of Enoch," pp. 176-200.

"Enoch Himself as the Son of Man," pp. 201-218.

(Cf. the review by Rudolf Bultmann of Otto's 1934 German Edition, *ThRu*, n.f. IX (1937), 1-35; see esp. pp. 22-24.)

Dodd, C. H. "Son of Man." *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958, pp. 241-262.

Grelot, P. "La Géographie Mythique d'Hénoch et Ses Sources orientales." *RB* 65 (1958): 33-69.

________. "La Légende d'Hénoch dans les Apocryphes et dans la Bible. Origine et Signification." *RevSR* 46 (1958): 5-26; 181-210.

Milik, J. T. "Hénoch au Pays des Aromates; ch. XXVII à XXXII; Fragments araméens de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân with text and translation ." *RB* 65 (1958): 70-77.

Sanders, Ian L. "The Origin and Significance of the Title 'The Son of Man'." *Scr* 10 (1958): 49-56.

Grelot, P. "L'Eschatologie des Esséniens et le Livre d'Hénoch." *RdQ* 1 (1958-59): 113-131.

Abertson, J. "Application of Mathematical Probability to Manuscript Discoveries." *JBL* 78 (1959): 133-141.
Abertson here writes against the background of J. T. Milik's assessment of the lack of a single fragment of the "Son of Man" sections of Enoch from the several MSS sources unearthed at Qumran. Milik had written: "this omission cannot be the result of chance" (*Ten Years of Discovery . . .*). Abertson's conclusion agrees with Milik's.

Bietenhard, W. "Die 'Konsequente Eschatologie,' das Buch Henoch und Qumran." *Kirchenblatt fur die reformierte Schweiz* 115 (Basel, 1959): 274ff.

Milik, J. T. "The Qumran Library: Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: The Book of Enoch." *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. Trans. by J. Strugnell. *Studies in Biblical Theology 26*. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959, pp. 33-34.
Milik deals with the absence of the *parables* of I Enoch in the Qumran materials and concludes that this section of Enoch is the work of a Judeo-Christian of the second century A.D. Cf. the article by Abertson cited above which seeks to test via Mathematical probability Milik's assumption that the absence of this Enoch material could not have been simply a matter of chance.

Plöger, O. "Henochbücher." *RGG*^{3}, 3 (1959): cols. 222-225.

Geoltrain, P. "Le Livre éthiopien d'Hénoch; Ses Rapports avec les MSS de Qumran et le NT." Thèse. Strasbourg, 1960.

Muilenburg, James. "The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch." *JBL* 79 (1960): 197-209.

Ullendorff, E. "An Aramaic 'Vorlage' of the Ethiopic Text of Enoch?" *Quaderni...Lincei* 48 (1960): 259-268.

Waxman, Meyer. "The Book of Enoch." *History of Jewish Literature*, 1 (1960): 27-31.

Doeve, J. W. "Lamech's achterdocht in 1Q Genesis Apokryphon." *NedThT* 15 (1960/61): 401-415.

Thompson, G. G. P. "The Son of Man: The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *ET* 72 (1960-61): 125.

Coppens, Joseph, and Dequeker, Luc. *Le Fils de l'Homme et les Saints du Très-Haut en Daniel, VII, dans les Apocryphes et dans le Noveau Testament*. 2e edition augmentée. Louvain: Publication Universitaires de Louvain, 1961.

Dupont-Sommer, Andre. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Trans. by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961, pp. 295-305. (Especially significant for *Enoch* and the *Testaments of the XII*.

Ettisch, E. E. "Das Buch Henoch und die vier Kardinalpunkte des Sonnenlaufes [cp. 72, 13-16]." *VT* 11 (1961): 444-445.

Klauser, T. "Der Vorhang vor dem Throne Gottes *Hen. aeth.*; Ps 18, 12 ." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 3 (Munster, 1961): 141-142.

Thorndike, J. P. "The Apocalypse of Weeks I Enoch 93, 1-10; 91, 12-17 and the Qumran Sect." *RdQ* 3 (1961): 163-184.

Thorndike proposes that the Apocalypse of Weeks (93, 1-10; 91, 12-17) is "a secret history of the Qumran sect." He sees evidence of "an intimate relationship between this literature and the Qumran sect," and believes the "great events" listed in the Apocalypse of Weeks are paralleled by episodes referred to in the writings of the sect. (Cf. Adam C. Welch. "A Zealot Pamphlet." *Exp*, 8th series, 25 (1923): 273-287, who, writing before the era of the DSS, interprets this section quite differently.)

XUM

Weiser, Artur. "The Ethiopic Book of Enoch." *Old Testament: Formation and Development* (1961), pp. 425-429.

Kutsch, E. "Die Solstitien im Kalender des Jubiläenbuches und in äth. Henoch 72." *VT* 12 (1962): 205-207.

Rist, Martin. "Enoch, Book of." *IDB* 2 (1962): 103-105.

Doeve, J. W. "Parousieverzögerung." *NedThT* 17 (1962/63): 32-38. (I Enoch 91:12-17; ch. 93.)

Caquot, A., and Geoltrain, P. "Note sur le Texte Éthopien des 'Paraboles' d'Hénoch." *Sem* 13 (1963): 39-54.

Glasson, T. F. "The Book of Enoch"; "Enoch and the New Testament"; "The Date of the Similitudes." *The Second Advent: The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*. 3rd. edition. London: The Epworth Press, 1963, pp. 15-29; 30-47; 48-53. (See note on 1945 edition.)

Rese, M. "Überprüfung einiger Thesen von J. Jeremias zum Thema des Gottesknechtes im Judentum Test. Benj. 3, 8; Hen. aeth.; Targum . . . ." *ZThK* 60 (1963): 21-41.

Rowley, H. H. *Relevance*.

"The Ethiopic Book of Enoch (I Enoch)," pp. 57-64.

"The Date of the Earliest Sections of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch," pp. 93-99.

Coppens, J. "Le Fils d'Homme Danielique vizir Celeste [spec. de *Hen. aeth*. 37-71]." *ETL*, XL (1964), 72-80.

Foerster, Werner. "The Essene Movement and Apocalyptic"; World-History and Its Goal." *From the Exile to Christ. A Historical Introduction to Palestinian Judaism*. Trans. by Gordon E. Harris from the 3rd German Edition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964, pp. 74-81; 192-201.

Foerster notes (as others have done) that the "parables" of Enoch are not found at Qumran and "may therefore stand at a further remove from the Essene movement" (p.76). He goes on, however, to discuss briefly the "crucial ideas" which are found in Enoch as well as in the earlier Qumran writings (cf. pp. 77-81).

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Ethiopic Book of Enoch." OT--Introduction (1965), pp. 617-622.

Tödt, H. E. "The Transcendent Sovereignty of the Son of Man in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965, pp. 22-31. (See also pp. 297-302.)
Tödt here deals with Daniel 7:13f., IV Ezra 13, and the Similitudes of I Enoch.

"Enoch, Books of." EJR (1966), p. 129.

Perrin, Norman. "Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity; A Suggestion." BR 11 (1966): 17-28.

Riessler, Paul. "Henochbuch oder Erster Henoch." Altjüdisches Schrifttum (1966), pp. 355-451; 1291-97.

Brandon, S. G. F. The Judgment of the Dead. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967. On I Enoch see: "Hebrew Religion: Judgment as Divine Vindication," pp. 56-75 (esp. pp. 69-72).

Hooker, Morna D. "The Son of Man in I Enoch." "Son of Man and Related Concepts in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and Its Use in St. Mark's Gospel. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967, pp. 33-48; 67-69.

Moule, C. F. D. The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Implication of Certain Features of the New Testament. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Ic., 1967.
See especially pp. 34-35, footnote 21. On the basis of the lack of DSS materials on the "similitudes" of I Enoch, Moule concludes that they are to be dated rather late. Subsequently, according to Moule, Daniel 7 appears to be the "sure background" for the NT "Son of Man" concept.

Borsch, F. H. "I Enoch." The Son of Man in Myth and History (1967), pp. 145-156.

________. "Mark XIV.62 and I Enoch LXII.5." NTS 14 (1967-68): 565-567.

Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach." NTS 14 (1967-68):

551-565.
This author concludes that the Similitudes best fit the historical situation of 115-117 A.D. rather than 40-38 B.C. In this case, the Similitudes are best ignored in our assessment of the backgound of the NT "Son of Man" concept.

Leivestad, R. "Der Apokalyptische Menschensohn ein theologisches Phantom." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4 (Leiden, 1967-68): 49-105.

Reese, G. "Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums. Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des athiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4 Esrabuches." Diss. Heidelberg, 1967-68.

Brock, S. P. "A Fragment of Enoch 6, 106 in Syriac." *JThS*, n.s., 19 (1968): 626-631.

Bruce, F. F. *New Testament History*. Camden, New Jersey: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1969.
The following general survey sections are especially helpful in seeing the Jewish apocalyptic as a part of the context out of which Christianity grew: "The Messianic Hope," pp. 116-127 (the "Similitudes" esp. pp. 124ff.): "Jesus and the Kingdom of God," pp. 155-169 (esp. 165ff.).

Hengel, Martin. "Die Chasidim und der erste Hohepunkt jüdischer Apokalyptik." *Judentum und Hellenismus*. (*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 10, herausgegeben von J. Jeremias und D. Otto Michel.) Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1969, pp. 319-381, passim.

Schreiner, Josef. "Das äthiopische Henochbuch." *Apokalyptik* (1969), pp. 27-34.

Brandon, S. F. G. "Enoch, Books of." *DCR* (1970), p. 260.

Denis, Albert-Marie. "Le Livre grec d'Hénoch (éthiopien)." *Pseudépigraphes Grecs* (1970), pp. 15-30.

Fiedler, Martin Johannes. "Δικαιοσύνη in der diaspora-judischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur." *JSJ* 1 (1970): 120-143. See esp. Section 2. "Die palastine-judischen Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen," pp. 134-142.

II ENOCH (=THE SECRETS OF ENOCH; SLAVONIC ENOCH)

Charles, R. H. "The Seven Heavens. An Early Jewish and Christian Belief." ET 7 (1895-96): 57-61; 115-118.

Bonwetsch, G. Nathanael. Das slavische Henochbuch. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896.

Charles, R. H., and Morfill, W. R. The Book of the Secrets of Enoch. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896. (See the Review articles by Selbie and Lods cited next.)

Selbie, J. A. "The Slavonic Enoch." ET 8 (1896-97): 383-384.

Selbie reviews Charles and Morfill, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch.

Lods, M. A. "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, W. R. Morfill and R. H. Charles, 1896" (a review article). RHR 34 (1896): 391-395.

Loisy, Alfred. "Un Nouveau Livre d'Henoch (Secrets of Enoch)." RHLR 1 (1896): 29-57.

Nestle, Eb. "Eph. v.14 and the Secrets of Enoch." ET 9 (1897-98): 376-377.

Littmann, Enno. APAT 2 (1900): 218, note a.

Barton, G. A. "On the Jewish-Christian Doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Messiah." JBL 21 (1902): 78-91.

See especially p. 79; II Enoch 23:5. A view of the pre-existence of "all souls" is set forth.

Dods, Marcus. "The Books of Enoch." Forerunners of Dante. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903, pp. 117-126. On Slavonic Enoch, see esp. pp. 120ff.

Tennant, F. R. "The Fall and Original Sin in Jewish Pseudepigraphic Literature: VIII. The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (The Slavonic Book of Enoch)." Sources (1903), pp. 204-211.

Beer, Georg. RE^3 (1905): 242.

Porter, F. C. "The Secrets of Enoch." The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905, pp. 332-334.

Reid, Georg J. "Book of the Secrets of Henoch (Slavonic Henoch)." CathEnc 1 (1907): 604.

Förster, Max. "Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung. Ein lateinisches Fragment des sogenannt slawischen Henoch." ARW 11 (1908): 477-529.

Hughes, H. Maldwyn. "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and Christian Ethics." IJA, xix (October 1909): 77-79.

Schürer, Emil. "Das slavische Henochbuch." Geschichte, 3 (1909): 290-294.

Beer, Georg. "The Slavonic Enoch." NSHE 9 (1911): 336.

Charles, R. H. "Enoch, Book of the Secrets of." DB(H) 1 (1911): 708-711.

Wells, L. S. A. "The Historical Succession of the Books of Enoch: 'The Secrets of Enoch'." IJA, xxv (1911): 30-34.

Barton, G. A. "The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 A. D." JBL 3 (1912): 156-167.

Barton contends that II Enoch makes much of angels and almost nothing of demons. Since the author's main concern has been to catalogue alphabetically and summarize briefly (giving the significant literary references) both the "good angels" and the "fallen angels and demons," this article has value only for general reference.

Charles, R. H., and Forbes, Nevill. "2 Enoch, or The Book of the Secrets of Enoch." Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 425-469.

Clarke, W. K. Lowther. "St Luke and the Pseudepigrapha: Two Parallels." JThS 15 (1913/14): 597-599.

Clarke cites parallels between II Enoch (A) lxvii. 1-3, lxviii 1, 5-7 and Luke xxiii. 44, 47-48; 52.

Charles, R. H. Religious Development (1914), pp. 239-242.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Books of the Secrets of Enoch." *Books of the Apocrypha* (1914), pp. 220-222.

Ferrar, W. J. "II Enoch (Secrets of Enoch)." *Uncanonical Jewish Books* (1918), pp. 85-87.

Maunder, A. S. D. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch." *The Observatory* 41 (London, 1918): 309-316.

Cf. J. K. Fotheringham's praise of Maunder's position and his criticism of Charles's, *JThS* 20 (1919-20): 252, and *JThS* 23 (1921-22): 49-56. See too, Charles's answer to Fotheringham, *JThS* 22 (1921): 161-163.

Fotheringham, J. K. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch." *JThS* 20 (1919-20): 252.

Fotheringham gives a brief, one-page word of praise for Maunder's article, *Ibid*.

Schmidt, Nathaniel. "The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch." *JAOS* 41 (1921): 307-312.

Charles, R. H. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch." *JThS* 22 (1921): 161-163.

An answer to Fotheringham's article, *JThS* 20 (1919): 252.

Fotheringham, J. K. "The Easter Calender and the Slavonic Enoch." *JThS* 23 (1921-22): 49-56.

Fotheringham again details his reasons for accepting a late date for II Enoch and his criticism of Charles's early date. Cf. the articles cited above.

Bonwetsch, N. *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs. Das Sogenannte Slavische Henochbuch*. Band XLIV, Heft 2: *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Hrsg. von A. Von Harnack und Carl Schmidt. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "Gehenna and Paradise in the Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament." *Heaven and Hell* (1923), pp. 59-80, passim. (See esp. pp. 67-70.)

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Date of Slavonic Enoch." *HThR* 16 (1923): 397-398.

Frey, J.-B. "Le Livre d'Hénoch slave ou Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch." *DBS* 1 (1928): cols. 448-454.

Hughes, H. M. *Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature*, 1928. "The Moral Ideal: Its Content and Development," pp. 113-117; "Moral Evil," pp. 198-202, 213.

Booth, Henry K. "Messianic Prophecy Between the Testaments." *The Bridge Between the Testaments: A Survey of the Life and Literature of the Period of the Connections*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929, pp. 189-200.

Sveral parallels are cited to demonstrate the influence of this literature upon NT thought. (See especially pp. 195-196.) For example, Booth cited: II Enoch 9:1 = Matt. 25:35; II Enoch 10:4 = Matt. 25:42; II Enoch 61:2 = John 14:2. Notice the interesting conclusion drawn by C. F. Potter (*Did Jesus Write This Book*? New York: University Books, 1965) from this same type of evidence.

Mangenot, E. "Livres d'Hénoch.--2. Livre slave." *DThC* I, 2 (1930): cols. 1482-85.

Lagrange, M.-J. *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (1931), pp. 258-262.

Herford, R. Travers. "The Secrets of Enoch (2 Enoch)." *Talmud and Apocrypha* (1933), p. 258.

Volz, Paul. "Das slavische Henochbuch." *Eschatologie*^{2} (1934), pp. 34-35.

Gry, Leon. "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'etres mysterieux en II Hénoch." *RB* 49 (1940): 195-204.

Lods, Adolphe. "Le Livre Slave d'Hénoch ou Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch." *Histoire de la Littérature* (1950), pp. 935-941.

Vaillant, André. *Le Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch. Texte Slave et Traduction Française*. IV: *Textes Publies par l'Institut d'Etudes slaves*. Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952.

See the review of Vaillant's work by Jean Daniélou, *RSR* 43 (1955): 569-572.

Klausner, Joseph. "The Slavonic Book of Enoch." *Messianic Idea in Israel* (1955), p. 383.

Otto, Rudolf. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*.

Trans. from the Revised German edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf. Boston: Starr King Press, 1957, pp. 176-200, passim. Esp. pp. 196-200.

Weiser, Artur. "The Slavonic Book of Enoch." Old Testament: Formation and Development (1961), pp. 430-431.

Rubinstein, Arie. "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Henoch." JJS 13 (1962): 1-21. (Especially: Section 4. "Jewish or Christian Origin of Slavonic Enoch.")

Charles. R. H. "2 Enoch (1-50 A.D.)." Eschatology (1963), pp. 315-320.

Rowley, H. H. "The Slavonic Book of Enoch (2 Enoch)." Relevance (1963), pp. 110-113.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Slavonic Book of Enoch." OT--Introduction (1965), pp. 622-623.

Meščerskij, N. A. "Zur Frage der Quellen des slawischen Buches Henoch (russ)." Kratkie Soobščenija Institute Narodor Azii 86 (1965): 72-78.

Potter, C. F. Did Jesus Write This Book? New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1965.

Riessler, Paul. "Henochbuch (slavisch) oder Zweiter Henoch." Altjüdisches Schrifttum^{2} (1966), pp. 452-473; 1297-98.

"The Secrets of Enoch." EJR (1966), p. 129.

Borsch, Frederick Houk. "II Esdras, II Enoch, The Testament of Levi, Etc." Son of Man in Myth and History (1967), pp. 156-167; esp. 159-160. (See too, pp. 199-200.)

Schreiner, Josef. "Das slavische Henochbuch." Apokalyptik (1969), pp. 54-55.

Brandon, S. G. F. "The Books of Enoch." DCR (1970), p. 260.

Only a very brief comment is made on II Enoch in Brandon's general summary of the Enoch literature.

THE FOURTH BOOK OF EZRA (=II ESDRAS)

Laurence, Richard. *Primi Ezrae Libri, qui apud vulgatam appellatur quartus, versio Aethiopica; nuc primo in medium prolata, et Latine Angeliceque reddita*. Oxoniae: Typis Academicis, 1820.

Lücke, Friedrich. "Das vierte Buch Esra." *Einleitung*^{2} (1852), pp. 144-212.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. "Die Apokalypse des Esra." *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (1857), pp. 185-242.

Ewald, Heinrich. "Neue Dichtung und Weissagung.--Das 4te Ezrabuch." *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*^{2} 7 (1859): 59-78.

Gutschmid, Alfred von. "Die Apokalypse des Esra und ihre spätern Bearbeitungen." *ZWTh* 3 (1860): 1-81.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. "Die jüdische Apokalyptik und die neuesten Forschungen. 4. Die Apokalypse oder das 4. Buch des Esra." 3 (1860): 335-358.

Volkmar, Gustav. "Einige Bemerkungen über Apokalyptik, über Esra IV und Henoch im Besondern." 4 (1861): *ZWTh* 83-92; 111-136.

________. *Das Vierte Buch Esra*. Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen, Bd. 2, herausgegeben von G. Volkmar. Tübingen: L. F. Fuess, 1863.

Steiner, H. "Der arabische Auszung des 'Propheten Esra,' nebst Berichtigungen zu der arabischen Uebersetzung." *ZWTh* 11 (1868): 396-433.

Wieseler, K. "Das vierte Buch Esra, nach Inhalt und Alter untersucht." *ThStKr* 43 (1870): 263-304.

Fritzsche, Otto Fridolin. "Das vierte Buch Esra." *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Graece*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1871.

Bensly, R. L. *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra, Discovered, and Edited with an Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge: The

University Press, 1875. (See the review by Hermann Ronsch, *ZWTh* 19 (1876): 435-438.)

Thoma, Albrecht. "Apokalypse und Antiapokalypse." *ZWTh* 20 (1876-77): 289-341.
The author makes only a brief reference to IV Ezra, p. 309; he believes the writer of the Apok. of Joh. borrowed from the Ezra-Apok.

Drummond, James. "Fourth Ezra." *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 84-117, and passim. (Cf. pp. 117-132 for the similarities and differences between the Apocalypse of Baruch and IV Ezra.)

Renan, E. *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme, Livre 5: Les Évangiles et la Seconde Génération Chrétienne*. Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1877, pp. 348-373.

Dillmann, August. *RE*^{2} 12 (1883): 353-356.

Edersheim, Alfred. *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company/ London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1885, pp. 340-341; 347.
The author suggests that 4 Ezra bears "evident reference to the writings of St. Paul" (p. 340), and that ch. 13:27-50 makes it impossible "to avoid the conclusion, that the writer had been acquainted with the Discourses about the 'Last Things'." (p. 347)

Rosenthal, Ferdinand. "Das vierte Buch Esra." *Vier Apokryphische Bücher aus der Zeit und Schule R. Akiba's*. Leipzig: Otto Schulze, 1885, pp. 38-71.

Stanton, V. H. *Jewish and Christian Messiah* (1886), pp. 64-75.

Dillmann, Christian Friedrich August. "Über des Adlergesicht in der Apokalypse des Esra." Berlin, 1888, pp. 215-237. [Excerpt: *Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Sitzungsberichte*, 1888.]

Eddrup, E. P. "II(IV) Esdras." *The Old Testament According to the Authorized Version. With a Brief Commentary by Various Authors. The Apocryphal Books. Esdras to Maccabees*. Published Under the Direction of the Tract Committee. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1889. [Pages not numbered.]

Kabisch, R. *Das 4. Buch Esra auf seine Quellen untersucht*.

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1889.

Thomson, John E. H. "Post-Christian Apocalypses. The Fourth Book of Esdras"; "Critical Notes on Post-Christian Apocalypses--Fourth Esdras: Date, Language, Etc." Books Which Influenced Our Lord (1891), pp. 348-355; 455-458.

Zöckler, D. Otto. "Pseudepigraphische Weissagungen in Apokalypse-Form. 11. Die Esra-Apokalypse (das 4. Buch Esra)." Die Apokryphen des AT (1891), pp. 444-472.

Lévi, Israel. "La Pesikta Rabbati et le 4^e Ezra." Isidore Loeb Festschrift. (REJ 24) Paris: Librairie A. Durlacher, 1892, pp. 281-285.

Lévi points out that 4. Ezra 9-10 and Pesikta Rabbati, fol. 131b-132b show points of contact.

Bensly, R. L. The Fourth Book of Ezra, with Introduction by M. R. James. Texts and Studies, Vol. 3, No. 2. Cambridge: The University Press, 1895. (See the reviews of this work by Hilgenfeld, ZWTh 39 (1896): 478-480, and Lods, RHR 34 (1896): 385-388.)

Loisy, Alfred. "Bibliographie Scripturaire. IV: IV^e Livre d'Esdras." RHLR 1 (1896): 193-194.

In this brief section of a larger bibliographical article, Loisy refers to a prior study of his, "Un Nouveau Livre d'Hénoch," in the same journal (pp. 29-57) and shows the relationship between 4. Ezra and Slavonic Enoch.

Schürer, Emil. "The Fourth Book of Ezra." History 3 (1896): 93-114; Geschichte 3 (1909): 315-335.

Clemen, C. "Die Zusammensetzung des Buches Henoch, der Apokalypse des Baruch, und des vierten Buches Esra." ThStKr 71 (1898): 211-246.

Wellhausen, Julius. "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur." Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. Sechstes Heft. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1899, pp. 215-249.

Wellhausen deals with both Baruch (Syriac) and 4. Ezra and attempts to prove a Hebrew original for 4. Ezra.

Asmussen, P. "Das Adlergesicht im vierten Esrabuche." MGWJ 44 (1900): 97-114.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Der Prophet Esra (IV Esra)*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900.

________. "Das 4. Buch Esra." *APAT* 2 (1900): 331-401. See the review note by W. C. van Manen, *ThT* 36 (1902): 86-90.

Preuschen, Erwin. "Ardaf IV. Esra 9, 29 und der Montanismus." *ZNW* 1 (1900): 265-266.

Schriefer, F. Walther. *Die religiösen und ethischen Anschauungen des IV. Ezrabuches im Zusammenhang dargestellt. Ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Religionsgeschichte*. Leipzig: Dörfling & Franke, 1901.

Barton, G. A. "On the Jewish-Christian Doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Messiah." *JBL* 21 (1902): 78-91. (Esp. p. 80 = 4 Ezra 12:32; 13:26, 52.)

Manen, W. C. van. A brief review note on Gunkel's *Der Prophet Esra* from the Kautzsch volume, *APAT* 2(1900). *ThT* 36 (1902): 86-90.

Littmann, Enno, and Kohler, Kaufmann. "Esdras, Books of." *JE* 5 (1903): 219-222.

Tennant, F. R. "The Fall and Origianl Sin in Jewish Pseudepigraphic Literature: *4 Ezra (II Esdras)*." *Sources* (1903), pp. 220-232.

Beer, Georg. *RE*^{3} 16(1905): 244-249. Beer includes in his discussion the fifth and sixth books of Ezra (chs. 1-2 and 15-16) in addition to IV Ezra (chs. 3-14).

Gressmann, Hugo. "Der 'Mensch' im IV Esra." *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1905, pp. 349-355.

Lagrange, M.-J. "Notes sur les messianisme au temps de Jésus: L'Apocalypse d'Esdras (IV Esdras)." *RB* 2 (1905): 486-501.

Muirhead, L. A. "The Messianic Hope." *The Time of Christ*. New Edition with Some Alterations and Additions. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905, pp. 112-150, passim.

Porter, F. C. "The Apocalypse of Ezra." *The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905, pp. 334-351.

Strack, Hermann. "Das vierte Buch 'Esra'." Einleitung AT^2 (1906), pp. 177-178.

Along with several other books (e.g., Enoch, and the Testaments of the Twelve), Strack labels IV Ezra as "prophetische pseudepigraphe."

Vaganay, Léon. Le Problème eschatologique das le IVe Livre d'Esdras. Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, Editeurs, 1906. (See the review article by Muirhead, Lewis A. "The Eschatology of 4 Esdras." ET 18 (1906-07): 406-409. Cf. Lagrange, RB 4 (1907): 614-616.

Montefiore, C. G. "The Fourth Book of Esdras." IJA x (July, 1907): 6-7.

Reid, George J. "Fourth Book of Esdras." CathEnc 1 (1907): 603-604.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Messianic Teaching of IV. Esdras." IJA xi (October, 1907): 8-10; xii (January, 1908): 11-13; xvii (April, 1909): 29-31.

Abbott, E. A. "'Son of Man' in Graeco-Jewish Literature: Section 2. The Second Book of Esdras." Son of Man (1910), pp. 57-58. See also pp. 23-118, passim.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. "Biblical Texts From the Papyri." BW, n.s., 36 (1910): 67-68.

Hunt, A., ed. "Das griechisch Bruchstück zu 15, 57-59." The Oxyrhynchos Papyri Part VII. London: Oxford University Press, 1910.

Violet, Bruno. Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra). Erster Teil: Die Überlieferung. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910.

Badham, F. P. "The Title 'Son of Man'." ThT 45 (1911): 395-448. (See esp. 445, 446.)

Badham suggests that 4 Ezra 7.32,33 appears as a quotation of Enoch 1.1,3, and doubts that the title (?) in 4 Ezra 13.1,3 has any more force than simply "the man."

Beer, Georg. "II (IV) Ezra." NSHE 9 (1911): 337-338.

________. "V and VI Ezra." NSHE 9 (1911): 338.

Box, G. H. "A Contribution to the Study of II. Esdras." IJA xxvi (July, 1911): 53-54.

Frew, David. "Divergent Ideas in the Teaching of Fourth Esdras." *IJA* xxii (January, 1911): 2-4.

Sigwalt, C. "Die Chronologie des 4. Buches Esdras." *BZ* 9 (1911): 146-148.

Simonsen, David Jakob. *Ein Midrasch im IV. Buch Esra.* Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1911. Reprinted from: *Festschrift zu Israel Lewy's 70. Geburtstag.* Herausgegeben von M. Brann und J. Elbogen.

Simonsen discusses the relation of IV. Ezra 7:132-139 to Exodus 34:6-7.

Thackeray, H. St. J. "Esdras, Second Book of." *DB(H)* 1 (1911): 763-766.

Barton, G. A. "The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 A.D." *JBL* 31 (1912): 156-167. See esp. p. 158, "Uriel."

The article is valuable only for general reference, since Barton's main concern has been to catalogue alphabetically and summarize briefly both "the good angels" and "fallen angels and demons."

Box, G. H. *The Ezra-Apocalypse. Being Chapters 3-14 of the Book Commonly Known as 4 Ezra (or II Esdras).* London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1912.

Sanday, A. A review of G. H. Box, *The Ezra-Apocalypse.* *IJA* xxx (July, 1912): 43-46.

Frew, David. A review of G. H. Box, *The Ezra-Apocalypse.* *IJA* xxxvi (January, 1914): 18-20.

________. *The Apocalypse of Ezra (II. Esdras iii-xiv).* Translations of Early Documents. Series I: Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic), edited by W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

Daubney, W. H. "A Paraphrase Upon II. Esdras vi. 38-45." *IJA* xxix (April, 1912): 23-24.

Barry, Phillips. "The Apocalypse of Ezra." *JBL* 31 (1913): 261-272.

This article focuses upon a late date for IV Ezra based on the Eagle Vision and "a lost Hadrianic apocalypse."

Box, G. H. "4 Ezra." *APOT* 2 (1913): 542-624.

Charles, R. H. "4 Ezra: The Ezra Apocalypse." *Eschatology* (1913), pp. 337-353.

________. *Religious Development* (1914), pp. 249-252.

Wicks, H. J. "The Doctrine of the Messiah in Jewish Apocrypha and Apocalyptic." *IJA* xlvi (July, 1916): 34-36.

Völter, Daniel. "Die Geschichte vom Adler und vom Menschen im 4. Esra nebst Bemerkungen über die Menschensohnstellen in den Bilderreden Henochs." *NThT* 8 (1919): 241-273.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Ezra Apocalypse (2[4] Esdras)." *Books of the Apocrypha* (1914), pp. 509-531.

Emmet, C. W. "The Fourth Book of Esdras and St. Paul." *ET* 27 (1915-16): 551-556.

Emmet's interest is in emphasizing common problems vexing *all* mankind, Jews and Christians, which are concerns of both Ezra and Paul.

James, M. R. "Ergo Salathiel qui et Ezras." *JThS* 18 (1917): 167-169; 19 (1918): 347-349 (a later reflection upon his first article.)

Ferrar, W. J. "II. Esdras (Fourth Book of Ezra)." *Uncanonical Jewish Books* (1918), pp. 94-97.

Bentwich, Norman. "The Hellenistic-Jewish Literature." *Hellenism*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1919, pp. 197-245. (Esp. pp. 235-240.)

Bruyne, D. de. "Fragments d'une Apocalypse perdue." *RBén* 33 (1921): 97-109. 5 and 6 Ezra.

Keulers, Jos. *Die eschatologische Lehre des 4. Esrabuches*. Freiburg: Herder, 1922. (For reviews of this volume see: E. B. Allo, *RB* 31 (1922): 603-607; J. Hempel, *Theologische Blätter* 44 (Leipzig, 1923): 214-216.)

Messel, Nils. "Die Verborgenheit des Messias (bei Justin, 4 Esra und Evang Joh)"; "Über den Messias der Esra-Apokalypse." *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch*. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1922, pp. 71-76; 76-78.

Dupont, Georges. "Le Fils de l'Homme a la Fin du Judaisme."

Le Fils de l'Homme: Essai Historique et Critique. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1924, pp. 7-27; see esp. pp. 18-20, "L'Apocalypse d'Esdras."

Violet, Bruno. *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt. Mit Textvorschlagen für Esra und Baruch von Hugo Gressmann*. [Considered to be Teil II of Violet's 1910 volume on Ezra.] Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1924.

Blake, R. P. "The Georgian Version of Fourth Esdras From the Jerusalem Ms." *HThR* 19 (1926): 299-375; 22 (1929): 57-105.

Frey, J.-B. "Le IV^{e} Livre d'Esdras ou l'Apocalypse d'Esdras." *DBS* 1 (1928): cols. 411-418.

Hughes, H. M. "The Moral Ideal: Its Content and Development"; "Moral Evil"; "The Will"; "Moral Sanctions." *Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (1928), pp. 131-138; 207-210; 239-241; 304-308. In the pages cited Hughes deals with 4 Ezra specifically under the broad topics listed.

Booth, Henry K. "Messianic Prophecy Between the Testaments." *The Bridge Between the Testaments: A Survey of the Life and Literature of the Period of the Connections*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929, pp. 189-200.
Booth suggests several parallels between the "eschatological discourses" and 4 Esdras: e.g., 13:16=Matt. 24:9-12; 13:3=Matt. 24:30; 9:3=Matt. 24:7.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "The Baruch and the Ezra Apocalypses"; "The Ezra Apocalypse." *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929, pp. 189-195; 195-199.

Montefiore, C. G. *IV Ezra: A Study in the Development of Universalism*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1929.

Mundle, W. "Das religiöse Problem des IV. Esrabuches." *ZAW*, N.F., 6 (1929): 222-249.

Mangenot, E. "Apocalypses Juives.--~~III~~. Quatrième Livre d'Esdras." *DThC*, I, 2 (1930): cols. 1485-87.

Pelaia, B. M. "Eschatologie Messianica IV Libri Esdrae." *VD* 11 (1931): 244-249; 310-318.

Steinberg, Milton. "Job Answers God [ex Esdrae apocalypsi].

Being the Religious Perplexities of an Obscure Pharisee." *JR* 12 (1932): 159-176.

This article takes the form of a homily or sermon and is an excellent presentation from this perspective. It does not, however, deal at all with the critical questions involved in 4 Ezra.

Herford, J. Travers. "2 Baruch" and "4 Ezra." *Talmud and Apocrypha* (1933), pp. 258-260.

Oesterley, W. O. E. *II Esdras. (The Ezra Apocalypse). With Introduction and Notes*. Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1933. (See the review by Ernest W. Parsons, *JR* 14 (1934): 356-357.)

Mazerski, J. "Libri IV Esdrae doctrina hamartologica." *VD* 12 (1932): 374-376; 13 (1933): 84-90; 215-222; 247-250; 359-370.

Ellwein, Eduard. "Die Apokalypse des IV. Esdras und das urchristliche Zeugnis von Jesus dem Christus." *Wort und Geist, Studien zur christlichen Erkenntnis von Gott, Welt und Mensch, Festgabe für Karl Heim zum 60. Geburtstag am 20. Januar 1934*. Herausgegeben von Adolf Koberle und Otto Schmitz. Berlin: Furche-Verlag, 1934, pp. 29-47.

Kaminka, Armand. *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Esra-Apokalypse und zur Rekonstruktion ihres hebräischen Urtextes*. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus Verlag, 1934. Reprinted from *MGWJ* 76 (N.F. XL) (1932): 121-138; 206-212; 494-511; 604-607; 77 (N.F. XLI) (1933): 339-355. Cf. J. Bonsirven, *RSR* 15 (1935): 246-248.

Volz, Paul. "Die Esraapokalypse." *Eschatologie*^{2} (1934), pp. 35-40.

Garofalo, S. "De Iudaeorum fatis religiosis in apocrypho libro IV Esdras." *VD* 15 (1935): 280-288.

Manson, T. W. "God as King: The Final Consummation." *The Teaching of Jesus* (1935), pp. 244-284, passim.

Kaminka, Armand. *Liber Assiri Salathiels* [IV Esdras hebraice]. Tel-Aviv: "Dvir," 1936. (See T. H. Robinson, *ET* 48 (1936-37): 182.)

Holzmeister, Urban. "'Requiem aeternitatis' dona eis Domine et 'lux perpetua' luceat eis (4 Esr. 2, 34s.)." *VD* 17 (1937): 321-328.

Gry, Léon. *Les dires prophetiques d'Esdras (IV. Esdras).* 2 Vols. bound in one. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1938. (See the review by A. M. Vitti, *Bib* 22 (1941): 85-88.)

________. "Essai sur la plus ancienne teneur et la fortune du Catalogue des signes de la fin (IV Esdras V 1-14, VI 18-29, VII 26-38)." *RSPhTh* 29 (1940): 264-277.

________. "La 'Mort du Messie' en IV Esdras, VII, 29 [III, V,4]." *Mémorial Lagrange; Cinquantenaire de l'École biblique et archéologique française de Jerusalem (15 Novembre 1890--15 Novembre 1940).* Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 1940, pp. 133-139.

Sjöberg, Erik. "Känner 1 Henok och 4 Esra tanken på den libande Människosonen?" *Erling Eidem, S.S. theologiae doctori, summo suo praesidi, sexagenario, pie ac reverenter obtulit hunc fasciculum societas exegetica upsaliensis.* (Svensk exegetisk årsbok, V.) Uppsala: Wretmans boktryckeri A.-B., 1940, pp. 163-183.

Fuchs, Hugo. "Esdras, Books of." *UJE* 4 (1941): 163-165.

Torrey, C. C. "Second Esdras." *Apocryphal Literature* (1945(, pp. 116-123.

Causse, Antonin. "De la Jérusalem terrestre à la Jérusalem céleste." *In Memoriam Antonin.* (*RHPhR* vol. 27, No. 1-2.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1947, 12-36.

Causse deals chiefly with passages from I Enoch and 4 Ezra. He cites 4 Ezra 4:24-27, 35-37; 12:13-16; 14:35-36; 7:32-33; etc.

Bartels, R. A. "Law and Sin in Fourth Esdras and St. Paul." *LuthQ* 1 (1949): 319-329. (Cf. C. W. Emmet, "The Fourth Book of Esdras and St. Paul." *ET* 27 (1915-16): 551-556.)

Torrey, C. C. "A Twice-Buried Apocalypse." *Munera Studiosa.* Studies presented to William H. P. Hatch, edited by Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr., and Sherman Elbridge Johnson. Cambridge; Massachusetts: The Episcopal Theological School, 1946, pp. 23-39.

Dupont, J. "La sagesse préparée pour les élus. Étude sur le texte de IV Esdras VIII, 52-54." *RBén* 57 (1947): 3-11.

Oepke, Albrecht. "Ein bisher unbeachtetes Zitat aus dem fünften Buch Esra." *Coniectanea neotestamentica*, 11 in honorem Antonii Fridrichsen sexagenarii. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1947 , pp. 179-195.
This article contains a discussion of the relationship of the ideas of the church versus the synagogue (based on the first chapter of the Vulgate translation of 4 Esdras).

Torrey, C. C. "The Messiah Son of Ephraim." *JBL* 66 (1947): 253-277.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. "II (IV) Esdras." *History of New Testament Times* (1949), pp. 81-86.

Lods, Adolphe. "Le Quatrième Livre d'Esdras." *Histoire de la Littérature* (1950), pp. 985-997.

Stano, G. "4 Libri di Esdra." *Études et Commentaires* 5 (Paris, 1950): 561-563.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "II Esdras (The 'Ezra Apocalypse')." *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*. London: S.P.C.K., 1953, pp. 142-160.

Klausner, Joseph. "The Pseudepigraphic (Fourth) Book of Ezra." *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (1955), pp. 349-365.

Bloch, J. "Was There a Greek Version of the *Apocalypse of Ezra*?" *JQR*, n.s., 46 (1956): 309-320.
Bloch answers his own question negatively. Cf. Stone. "Some Remarks on the Textual Criticism of IV Ezra," *HThR* 60 (1967): 107-115, in which Bloch's assertion is refuted.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. "The Apocryphal Book of Esdras (hebr.)." *BetM* 1 (1956): 103-107.

Bentzen, Aage. "The Fourth Book of Ezra (Or: 2nd Esdras)." *Introduction to OT*^{3} 2 (1957): 246-247.

Bloch, J. "The Ezra-Apocalypse. Was It Written in Hebrew, Greek or Aramaic?" *JQR*, n.s., 48 (1957-58): 279-294.

________. "Some Christological Interpolations in the Ezra-Apocalypse." *HThR* 51 (1958): 87-94.

Brou, D. "Le IV^e Livre d'Esdras dans la Liturgie Hispanique et le Graduel Romain *Locus iste* de la Messe de la Dédicace." *Sacris Erudiri; Jaarboek voor* *godsdienstwetenschappen*. (Steenbrugge, Belgium, (1957), 75-109.

Metzger, Bruce M. "The 'Lost' Section of II Esdras (=IV Ezra)." *JBL* 76 (1957): 153-156. (This same article appeared in *New Testament Tools and Studies*, 8. Leiden: Brill, 1968, pp. 48-51.

________. "The Second Book of Esdras." *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957, pp. 21-30.

Plöger, O. "Esrabücher. III. Das 4. Esrabuch"; "IV. Das 5. und 6. Esrabuch." *RGG*^{3} 2 (1958): cols. 697-699; 699-700.

Prideaux, S. P. T. "The New Testament in the Light of the Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." *IJA* Ii (October, 1957): 56-58.
The author suggests the close similarity of the thoughts and language of Enoch, the Testaments of the XII, and 4 Ezra to "those of Our Lord" (p. 56). He fails, however, to deal with any specific ideas or passages.

Hollaardt, A. "A propos du Graduel *Locus iste* cf. 4 Esdr. 8, 21-24! . . ." *Ephemerides Liturgical* 73 (Rome, 1959): 206-211.

Waxman, Meyer. "IV Ezra (Esdras)." *History of Jewish Literature*, 1 (1960): 39-42.

Zimmermann, F. "Underlying Documents of IV Ezra." *JQR*, n.s., 51 (1960-61): 107-124.

Brockington, L. H. "II Esdras." *A Critical Introduction to the Apocrypha*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1961, pp. 20-32.

Weiser, Artur. "2 Esdras (4 Ezra)." *OT: Formation and Development* (1961), pp. 433-437.

Turner, Nigel. "Esdras, Books of." *IDB* 2 (1962): 140-142.

Glasson, T. F. "2 Esdras." *The Second Advent: The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*. Third edition. London: The Epworth Press, 1963, pp. 232-238.

Rowley, H. H. "4 Ezra (2 Esdras)." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 115-118.

________. "The Unity of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 156-159.

Foerster, Werner. "World-History and Its Goal." *From the Exile to Christ. A Historical Introduction to Palestinian Judaism*. Trans. by Gordon E. Harris from the 3rd revised German edition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964, pp. 192-201. (Cf. pp. 178-227, passim.)

Duensing, H. "Apocalyptic Prophecy of the Early Church: 1. The Fifth and Sixth Books of Esra." Trans. by David Hill. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *NTA* (1965): 689-703.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "IV Ezra (II Esdras)." *OT--Introduction* (1965), pp. 624-627. (Cf. pp. 629-630 for a note on the relationship between IV Ezra and Baruch.)

Stone, Michael E. *Features of the Eschatology of IV Esdras*. Diss. Harvard University, 1964. (See the abstract in *HThR* 58 (1965): 463.)

Metzger, Bruce M., ed. "The Second Book of Esdras." *The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha, Revised Standard Version*. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965, pp. 23-62.

Tödt, H. E. "The Transcendent Sovereignty of The Son of Man in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965, pp. 22-31.

Tödt here deals with Dan. 7:13f., IV Ezra 13, and the Similitudes of I Enoch. See also pp. 297-302.

"Esdras, Books of." *EJR* (1966), p. 132.

Perrin, Norman. "Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity; A Suggestion." *BR* 11 (1966): 17-28. See especially pp. 24-25, "IV Ezra 13."

Riessler, Paul. "Esdras viertes Buch"; "Esdras fünftes Buch"; "Esdras sechstes Buch." *Alt-jüdisches Schrifttum* (1966), pp. 255-309; 1282-85; pp. 310-317; 1285-86; pp. 318-327; 1286-87.

Stone, Michael E. "Paradise in 4 Ezra iv:8 and vii:36, viii:52." *JJS* 17 (1966): 85-88.

________. "Some Features of the Armenian Version of IV Ezra." Muséon 79 (1966): 387-400.

Borsch, Frederick Houk. "II Esdras, II Enoch, The Testament of Levi, Etc." Son of Man in Myth and History (1967), pp. 156-167.

Brandon, S. G. F. The Judgment of the Dead. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967. (On 4 Ezra, the "so-called Salathiel Apocalypse," see especially pp. 56-75: "Hebrew Religion: Judgment as Divine Vindication.")

Hooker, Morna D. "Son of Man and Related Concepts in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Term "Son of Man" and Its Use in St. Mark's Gospel. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967, pp. 49-74, especially pp. 49-56: "2 Esdras."

Moule, C. F. D. The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Inquiry Into the Implications of Certain Features of the New Testament. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1967.

See pp. 34-35, note 21. Moule, on the basis of lack of Dss materials on the "Similitudes" of Enoch, concludes that they are surely of a late date. 4 Ezra 13, too, is "notoriously of uncertain date," and was doubtless written after the death of Christ, thus playing no part in shaping early Christian traditions. Moule favors Dan. 7 as the background for the NT "Son of Man" traditions.

Stone, Michael E. "Some Remarks on the Textual Criticism of IV Ezra." HThR 60 (1967): 107-115.

Stone deals with several textual questions. He tries to refute Bloch's assertion that there was no Greek text; cf. Bloch, "Was There a Greek Version of the Apocalypse of Ezra?" JQR, n.s., 46 (1956): 309-320.

Reese, G. "Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des fruhen Judentums. Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochen-apokalypse des athiopischen Henochbucher, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4 Esrabuches." Diss. Heidelberg, 1967/68.

Stone, Michael E. "The Concept of the Messiah in IV Ezra." Studies in the History of Religions, Vol. 14:

Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1968, pp. 295-312.

________. "Manuscripts and Readings of Armenian IV Ezra." *Textus* 6 (1968): 48-61.

Schreiner, Josef. "Das IV. Esra-Buch." *Apokalyptik* (1969), pp. 56-61.

Brandon, S. G. F. "Esdras, Books of." *DCR* (1970), pp. 263-264.

Denis, A. M. "Les Fragments grecs de l'Apocalypse 4 Esdras." *Pseudépigraphes Grecs* (1970), pp. 194-200.

Thoma, C. "Jüdische Apokalyptik am Ende des ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts. Religionsgeschichtliche Bemerkungen zur syrischen Baruchapokalypse und zum vierten Esrabuch." *Kairos* 11 (1969): 134-144.

Thoma asserts that both Baruch and 4 Ezra have a common central concern: lamentation, accusation, and hope in the face of the destruction of Jerusalem.

Fiedler, Martin Johannes. "Δικαιοσύνη in der diasporajüdischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur." *JSJ* 1 (1970): 120-143. See especially Section 2, "Die palästina-jüdischen Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen," pp. 134-142.

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH

Laurence, Richard. *Ascensio Isaiae Vatis, opusculum pseudepigrahum, multis abhinc seculis, ut videtur, deperditum, nunc autem apud Aethiopae compertum, et cum versione Latina anglicanaque publici juris factum*. Oxoniae: J. Parker/Londini: F. C. et J. Rivington, 1819. Esp. pp. 141-180.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. "Apokryphen des Jesaias." *Philosogisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaia*. Zweyten Theiles. Leipzig: bey Friedr. Christ. Wilh. Vogel., 1821, pp. 45-56.

Nitzsch, Immanuel. "Nachweisung zweiter Bruchstücke einer alten lateinischen Uebersetzung vom 'Αναβατικὸν 'Ησαΐου, nebst berichtigenden Zusätzen zu der von Laurence herausgegebenen Bearbeitung dieses Apokryphons. Mit einer Zugabe von Dr. W. Gesenius." *ThStKr* 3 (1830): 109-246.

Gieseler, Jo. Car. Lud. *Vetus translatio latina Visionis Jesaiae, libri V. T. pseudepigraphi, edita atque praefatione et notis illustrata*. Academiae Georgiae Augustae, Prorector, cum Senatu, *Sacra Pentecostalia*, Anni MDCCCXXXII, pie concelebranda, indicunt. Gottingae: Typis Dieterichianis, 1832. [In most sources this is labeled simply: *Göttinger Pfingstprogramm*, 1832.]

Gfrorer, August Friedrich. *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*. Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart's Verlagshandlung, 1838, Bd. 1: pp. 65-69; Bd. 2: pp. 422-427.

Hoffmann, A. G. "Jesajas." *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*. Herausgegeben von T. S. Ersch und T. G. Grubers. Section 2, Bd. 15 (1838): 387-390.

Lücke, Friedrich. "Die Himmelfahrt und die Vision des „ Propheten Jesaias, 'Αναβατικόν ῞Οροσις 'Ησαΐου," *Einleitung*^{2} (1852), pp. 274-302.

Bleek. *ThStKr* 27 (1854): 994-998.
This article, covering pp. 959-1003, contains an extensive review of Lucke's *Einleitung*^{2}. (see

reference cited above); the section cited here deals specifically with the *Ascension of Isaiah*.

Jolowicz, H. *Die Himmelfahrt und Vision des Propheten Jesaia, aus dem Aethiopischen und Lateinischen ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem Commentar und einer allgemeinen Einleitung versehen. Ein Quellen-Beitrag zur Kenntniss des Urchristenthums*. Leipzig: F. Fleischer, 1854.

Ewald, Heinrich. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*^{2}, 7 (1859): 334-337. 3rd. edition appeared, 1868, 7, pp. 369-373.

Langen, Joseph. *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1866, pp. 157-167.

Dillmann, August. *Ascensio Isaiae, Aethiopice et Latine cum Prolegomenis, Adnotationibus Criticis*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1877. Esp. pp. V-XVIII.

Stokes, G. T. "Isaiah, Ascension of." *DCB* 3 (1877): 298-301.

Gebhardt, Oscar von. "Die Ascensio Isaiae als Heiligenlegende. Aus Cod. Gr. 1534 der Nationalbibliothek zu Paris." *ZWTh* 21 (1877-78): 330-353.

Harnack, Adolf. A review of Dillmann's *Ascension Isaiae Aethiopice et Latine*, 1877. *ThLZ* 3 (1878): cols. 78-80.

Renan, Ernest. *L'Église chrétienne*. Vol. 6 of *Origines du Christianisme*. Paris: Calmann Levy, Editeur. Ancienne Maison Michel Levy Freres, 1879, pp. 528-529.

Bissell, E. C. "The Ascension of Isaiah." *Apocrypha--OT* (1880), pp. 669-670.

Reuss, Eduard. *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*. Trans. from the 5th German edition by Edward L. Houghton. Vol. I. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1884, pp. 279-281.

Edersheim, Alfred. *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company/ London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1885, pp. 340-341.
In this section of his work, Edersheim is concerned primarily with 4 Ezra. In a footnote on p. 341, he mentions briefly the *Asc. of Isa.*: "Although based on an older Jewish document, the book

is chiefly of Christian heretical authorship."

Deane, William J. "The Ascension of Isaiah." *Pseudepigrapha* (1891), pp. 236-275.

Harnack, Adolf. *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur Bis Eusebius*. Erster Theil: *Die Überlieferung und der Bestand*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1893, pp. 854-856; Zweiter Theil: *Die Chronologie*, 1897, pp. 573-579, 714-716.

Thomson, John E. H. "Post-Christian Apocalypses"; "Critical Notes on Post-Christian Apocalypses--The Ascension of Isaiah." *Books Which Influenced Our Lord* (1891), pp. 340-348; 451-455.

Zöckler, D. Otto. "Pseudepigraphische Weissagungen in Apokalypse--Form. 5. Die Vision und Himmelfahrt Jesajä." *Die Apokryphen des AT* (1891), pp. 439-440.

Bousset, Wilhelm. *The Antichrist Legend. A Chapter in Christian and Jewish Folklore*. Trans. by A. H. Keane. London: Hutchinson and Co., 1896.

Clemen, C. "Die Himmelfahrt des Jesaja, ein ältestes Zeugnis für das römische Martyrium des Petrus." *ZWTh* 39 (1896): 388-415.

Schürer, Emil. "The Martyrdom of Isaiah." *History* 3 (1896): pp. 141-146. *Geschichte* 3 (1909): 386-393.

Zeller, Eduard. "Der Märtyrertod des Petrus in der Ascensio Jesaiae." *ZWTh* 39 (1896): 558-568.

Clemen, Carl. "Nochmals der Martyrertod des Petrus in der Ascensio Jesaiae." *ZWTh* 40 (1897): 455-465.

Bartlett, James V. "The Ascension of Isaiah, iii.13-iv.21." *The Apostolic Age, Its Life, Doctrine, Worship and Polity*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899, pp. 521-524.

Bartlett quotes at length from Dillmann's Latin version of the Ethiopic "in which alone this section survives." Cites evidence for dating this section ca. 65-66.

Beer, G. "Das Martyrium Jesajae." *APAT* 2 (1900): 119-127.

Charles, R. H. *The Ascension of Isaiah, Translated From the Ethiopic Version, Which, Together with the New Greek*

Fragment, the Latin Versions and the Latin Translation of the Slavonic, is Here Published in Full. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900.

Grenfell, B. P., and Hunt, A. S. Editors. *The Amherst Papyri. Being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Lord Amherst of Hackney, at Didlington Hall, Norfolk. Part I: The Ascension of Isaiah*. London: Oxford University Press, 1900. (Contains The Greek Fragment of 2:4-4:4.)

Schürer, E. A Review of Charles's volume, *The Ascension of Isaiah*. *ThLZ* 16 (1901): cols. 169-171.

Dods, Marcus. *Forerunners of Dante*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903. Esp. "The 'Descensus Christi'," pp. 83-100, passim.

Littmann, Enno. "Isaiah, Ascension of." *JE* 6 (1904): 642-643.

Beer, G. *RE*^{3} 16 (1905): 260-262.

Strack, Hermann. "Das Martyrium des Jesaja." *Einleitung AT*^{2} (1906), pp. 180-181.

Along with the *Book of Jubilees*, Strack discusses the *Ascension* under the broad heading: "Historische Pseudepigraphen."

Reid, Georg J. "The Ascension of Isaias." *CathEnc* 1 (1907): 606.

Martin, Francois. "Ascension d'Isaie, chap. I, V. 8." *OLZ* 11 (1908): cols. 220-222.

Bosse, Alfred. "Zur Erklärung der Apokalyse der Asc. Jesaiae." *ZNW* 10 (1909): 320-323.

Bosse relates Nero to "Beliars, des Muttermorders," and is concerned about the 1332 days of the *Ascension* (3:18-4:18) as it relates to the 1335 days of Daniel 12:12. Dillmann speaks of "einen Schreibfehler" die 2 in 1332 *statt* der 5 in 1335, etc.

Tisserant, Eugène. *Ascension d'Isaie, Traduction de la Version ethiopienne avec las principales Variantes*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1909. See review in *IJA* xx (January, 1910): 22.

Beer, G. "The Martyrdom of Isaiah." *NSHE* 9 (1911): 340-341.

Coulange, Louis. "Le Retour du Christ." *RHLR* 14 (1911): 544-556.
The author cites *L'Asc. d'Isaie*, IV, 2, and *Livres sibyllins*, IV, 121, v, 145, 363, in which Nero is presented as *l'antechrist*. See footnote 1, p. 553.

Lüdtke, W. "Beiträge zu slavischen Apokryphen. 3. Zur Ascensio Isaiae." *ZAW* 31 (1911): 222-226.

Robinson, J. Armitage. "Isaiah, Ascension of." *DB(H)* 2 (1911): 499-501.

Barton, G. A. "The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 A.D." *JBL* 31 (1912): 156-167.
The author does not deal specifically with the *Ascension*; he does, however, suggest a distinction between those who connected evil spirits with the account of Gen. 6:2-4 (e.g., I Enoch) and others who connected them more closely to the "sinful tendencies of men" (e.g., the *Testaments of the XII* and the *Ascension of Isaiah*). See esp. pp. 159-161.

Charles, R. H. "The Martyrdom of Isaiah." *APOT* 2 (1913): 155-162.
Charles deals here only with the "Martyrdom" which he feels to be purely Jewish. In his edition of the *Ascension* of 1900, he deals with the entire text as it now stands.

Burkitt, F. C. "Early Christian Apocalyptic Writing." *Apocalypses* (1914), pp. 44-50.
Under this heading Burkitt deals largely with the *Ascension of Isaiah*; see esp. pp. 44-48.

________. "On the Martyrdom of Isaiah." *Apocalypses* (1914), pp. 72-74.

Osterley, W. O. E. "The Ascension of Isaiah." *Books of the Apocrypha* (1914), pp. 219-220.

Ferrar, W. J. "Martyrdom of Isaiah." *Uncanonical Jewish Books* (1918), pp. 66-67.

Burch, Vacher. "The Literary Unity of the *Ascensio Isaiae*." *JThS* 20 (1919): 17-23.

Charles, R. H. *The Ascension of Isaiah*. With an Introduction by G. H. Box. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1919.

This volume printed as a part of the series, Translations of Early Documents, Series I: Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic), contains the translation done by Charles in 1900. The introduction by Box and its publication in this inexpensive series made this 1919 volume an added contribution in the field of pseudepigraphal study.

Burch, Vacher. "Material for the Interpretation of the *Ascensio Isaiae*." *JThS* 21 (1920): 249-265. (See Burch's previous article: *JThS* 20 (1919): 17-23.)

Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends* 4 (1925): 277-281; 6 (1925): 371-375.

Frey, J.-B. "L'Ascension d'Isaïe." *DBS* 1 (1928): cols. 409-411.

Galling, Kurt. "Jesaja-Adonis." *OLZ* 33 (1930): 98-102.

This article is cited by Lods, *Histoire de la Litt. Heb. et Juive* (1950), footnote 1, p. 928, as significant on the borrowing of the myth of Adonis.

Mangenot, E. "Apocalypses Chrétiennes.--I. Ascension d'Isaïe." *DThC* I, 2 (1930): cols. 1491-1492.

Herford, R. Travers. "The Martyrdom of Isaiah." *Talmud and Apocrypha* (1933), p. 256.

Surkau, Hans Werner. *Martyrien in jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938. Especially pp. 30-33.

Torrey, C. C. "The 'Martyrdom of Isaiah'." *Apocryphal* Literature (1945), pp. 133-135.

Lacau, P. "Fragments de l'Ascension d'Isaie en copte." *Melanges L. Th. Lefort*. (*Le Museon; Revue d'Etudes orientales*, 59.) Louvain, 1946, pp. 453-467.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *History of NT Times* (1949), pp. 73-74.

Lods, Adolphe. "Martyre d'Esaie et autres Midrachim de la meme epoque." *Histoire la Littérature* (1950), pp. 927-929.

Bernheimer, R. "The Martyrdom of Isaiah [Medieval

representations]." *The Art Bulletin*, 34 (1952): 19-34.

Flusser, David. "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect." *IEJ* 3 (1953): 30-47.

Danielou, Jean. "Bulletin d'Histoire des Origines chrétiennes. I.--Judäisme et Christianisme aux deux premiers siècles." *RSR* 43 (1955): 569-572.
Danielou reviews the volume by A. Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets d'Henoch* (1952), and draws some parallels between *II Enoch* and the *Ascension*.

Bentzen, Aage. "Martyrium et Ascensio Isaiae." *Introduction to OT*^{3} 2 (1957): p. 238.

Galling, Kurt. "Belial." *RGG*^{3} 1 (1957): cols. 1025-1026.

Meyer, R. "Himmelfahrt und Martyrium des Jesaja." *RGG*^{3} 3 (1959): cols. 336-337.

Weiser, Artur. "The Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah (Martyrium et Ascensio Isaiae)." *Old Testament: Formation and Development* (1961), pp. 418-420.

Rist, Martin. "Isaiah, Ascension of." *IDB* 2 (1962): 744-746.

Cothenet, É. "Isaïe (L'Ascension de)." *Catholicisme, Hier, aujourd'hui, demain . . .* , 6, 23 (Paris, 1963): 144-146.

Heussi, K. "Die *Ascensio Isaiae* und ihr vermeintliches Zeugnis für ein romisches Martyrium des Apostels Petrus." *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Jena* 12 (1963): 269-274.

Rowley, H. H. "The Ascension of Isaiah." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 123-126.

________. "The Duration of AntiChrist's Reign in the Ascension of Isaiah." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 159-160.

Vaillant, A. "Un Apocryphe Pseudo-bogomile. La Vision d'Isaïe." *Revue des Etudes slaves* 42 (Paris, 1963): 109-121.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah (Martyrium et Ascensio Isaiae)." *OT--Introduction* (1965), pp. 609-610.

Flemming, J., and Duensing, H. "Apocalyptic in Early Christianity: 2. The Ascension of Isaiah." Trans. by David Hill. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *NTA* 2 (1965): 642-663.

Erbetta, M. "Ascensione di Isaia 4, 3 e la testimonianza piu antica del martirio di Pietro." *Euntes Docete* 19 (Rome, 1966): 427-436.

"Isaiah, Ascension of." *EJR* (1966), p. 204.

Riessler, Paul. "Himmelfahrt des Jesaias." *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*^{2} (1966), pp. 481-484; 1300-01.

Philonenko, Marc. "Le *Martyre d'Ésaïe* et l'Histoire de la Secte de Qoumran." *Pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament et Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, I. Cahiers de la Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, 41. Par Marc Philonenko, Jean-Claude Picard, Jean-Marc Rosenstiehl, Francis Schmidt. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967, pp. 1-10.

Katz, E. "Das *Martyrium Isaiae*." *Communio Viatorum* 11 (Prague, 1968): 169-174.

Schreiner, Josef. "Martyrium und Himmelfahrt des Isaias." *Apokalyptik* (1969), pp. 51-52.

Denis, Albert-Marie. "Les Fragments grecs du Martyre d'Isaïe." *Pseudépigraphes Grecs* (1970), pp. 170-176.

THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES

Lücke, Friedrich. *Einleitung*^{2}, 1852.

"Die sibyllinische Apokalyptik der Juden in der Danielischen Periode," pp. 66-89.

"Die christlichen Sibyllinen," pp. 248-274.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. "Die jüdische Sibylle." *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (1857), pp. 51-90.

Ewald, Heinrich August. *Abhandlung über Entstehung, Inhalt und Werth der sibyllischen Bücher*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1858.

Frankel, Z. "Alexandrinische Messiashoffnungen." *MGWJ* 8 (1859): 241-261; 285-308; 321-380; 359-364.
A translation of the Greek Sibylline Oracles with brief notes.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. "Die jüdische Apokalyptik und die neuesten Forschungen. 2. Die jüdische Sibyllen-Weissagung." *ZWTh* 3 (1860): 313-319.

"Zur Textkritik der sibyllinischen Bücher." *ZWTh* 4 (1861): 437-439.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. "Die jüdischen Sibyllen und der Essenismus." *ZWTh* 14 (1871): 30-59.

Drummond, James. "The Sibylline Oracles." *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 10-17, and passim.

"The Sibylline Books." *Edinburgh Review* 146 (1877): 31-67.
A review of works relating to the Sibylline Oracles.

Bissell, E. C. "The Sibylline Oracles." *Apocrypha--OT* (1880), pp. 666-667.

Bouché-Leclercq, M. A. "Les Oracles Sibyllins (Livres II et III, Première Partie)." *RHR* 7 (1883): 236-248; 8 (1883): 619-634; 9 (1884): 220-233.

Redford, Robert A. "Growth of the Messianic Expectation."

Four Centuries of Silence; or, From Malachi to Christ. Chicago: Jansen McClurg & Co., 1885, pp. 145-168.

On the Oracles, see especially pp. 152-153. Redford sees only the Third Book as being of value, since it dates from the middle of the second century B.C. He declares that the rest "is worthless, as it was the composition of Christians, endeavoring to support Christianity by forging predictions which correspond to the facts of Christian history." (p. 152)

Stanton, V. H. *Jewish and Christian Messiah* (1886), pp. 41-43.

Lupton, Joseph H. "Sibylline Oracles, The." *DCB* 4 (1887): 644-649.

Hirsch, S. A. "The Jewish Sibylline Oracles," *JQR*, o.s., 2 (1889-90): 406-429.

Deane, William J. "The Sibylline Oracles." *Pseudepigrapha* (1891), pp. 276-344.

Zöckler, D. Otto. "Pseudepigraphe Orakel, insbes. die Sibyllinen. 1. Die Sibyllen-Weissagungen (Oracula Sibyllina)." *Die Apokryphen des AT* (1891), pp. 477-484.

von Gutschmid, Alfred. "Die sibyllenischen Bücher." *Kleine Schriften*. Band IV: *Schriften zur griechischen Geschichte und Literatur*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1893, pp. 222-278.

Friedlaender, Moritz. "La Sibylle juive et les Partis religieux de la Dispersion." *REJ* 29 (1894): 183-196.

Schürer, Emil. "Jewish Propaganda Under a Heathen Mask. 1. The Sibyllines." History 3 (1896): 270-292; *Geschichte* 3 (1909): 555-592.

Harnack, Adolf. "Die sibyllinischen Orakel." *Die Chronologie* 2 (1897): 184-189.

Mathews, Shailer. "The Jewish Messianic Expectation in the Time of Jesus." *BW*, n.s., 12 (1898): 437-443.

Mathews cites passages from the pseudepigraphal materials (e.g., Enoch 46:1-6; 51:1-3; 62:2; 69:27-29; 90:37-38; Sibylline Oracles 3:776-784; 5:332-335; 3:55-60; and others) with very little comment. The article offers very little help to the reader other than to suggest literary expressions of messianic expectation. From the format of the article, this may have been Mathews's only purpose.

Blass, F. "Die Sibyllinen." *APAT* 2 (1900): 177-217.

Lejay, Paul. "Ancienne Philologie Chrétienne: 13. Contemporains de la Paix de l'Eglise. Les Oracles sibyllins." *RHLR* 5 (1900): 191-192.

Geffcken, John. von. *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der "Oracula Sibyllina."* Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, N. F., Band VIII, Heft I. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902. Reissued 1967.

See the following reviews of Geffcken's work: *JThS* 4 (1902-03): 446-448 (R. H. Charles); *ET* 14 (1902-03): 60 (J. A. Selbie); *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 146 (1904): 197-242 (Alois Rzach).

________. "Die Sibylla." *Aus der Werdezeit des Christentums. Studien und Charakteristiken.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1904, pp. 31-49.

Muirhead, L. A. "The Messianic Hope." *The Times of Christ.* New Edition with Some Alterations and Additions. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905, pp. 112-150, passim.

White, Alfred. *"As David and the Sibyls Say." A Sketch of the Sibyls and the Sibylline Oracles.* Initiated and Projected by A. White. Collected Together and Concluded (at his request) by M. Monteiro. Edinburgh: Sandg & Co., 1905.

Abrahams, Israel. "Flavius Josephus and the Jewish Sibyl." *A Short History of Jewish Literature.* London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906, pp. 11-18.

Bousett, Wilhelm. "Sibyllen und sibyllinische Bücher." *RE*^{3} 18 (1906): 265-280.

Strack, Hermann. "Die sibyllinischen Orakel." *Einleitung AT*^{2} (1906), pp. 181-182.

Healy, Patrick J. "Sibylline Oracles." *CathEnc* 1 (1907): 770.

Kraus, Samuel. "Sibyl." *JE* 11 (1908): 319-323.

"The Sibylline Oracles." Selections from the English translation by Milton S. Terry (New York: Eaton and

Mains) from the Greek text of Rzach (1891). *IJA* xvii (April, 1909): 42-44.

Coulange, Louis. "L'Idée Messianique." *RHLR* 13 (1910): 131-143, passim.

________. "Le Retour du Christ." *RHLR* 14 (1911): 544-556. See especially footnote 1, p. 553, in which Coulange refers to *L'Asc. d'Isaïe*, IV, 2, and *Livres sibyllins*, IV, 121, V, 145, 363, in which Nero (so Coulange concludes) is presented as *l'antéchrist*.

Barton, G. A. "The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 A.D." *JBL* 31 (1912): 156-167. (Esp. p. 164, "Beliar", "Belial".)

Since Barton's main concern has been to catalogue alphabetically and summarize briefly (citing the significant literary references) both the "good angels" and the "fallen angels and demons," this article has value only for general reference.

Harris, J. Rendel. "Sibylline Oracles." *DB(H)*, Extra Volume, Containing Articles, Indexes, and Maps (1912): 66-68.

Lanchester, H. C. O. "The Sibylline Oracles." *APOT* 2 (1913): 368-406.

Charles, R. H. *Religious Development* (1914), pp. 226-227.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Sibylline Oracles." *Books of the Apocrypha* (1914), pp. 208-210.

Hands, A. W. "The Sibylline Oracles." *IJA* xliii (October, 1915): 67-69; xlvi (July, 1916): 38-41.

Scott, Walter. "The Last Sibylline Oracle of Alexandria (Oracula Sibyllina XIV. 284-306.)." *Classical Quarterly*, Oxford, 9 (1915): 144-166; 207-228; 10 (1916): 7-16.

Lanchester, H. C. O. "The Eschatology of the Sibylline Oracles." *IJA* xliv (January, 1916), 3-7.

Bate, H. N. *The Sibylline Oracles. Books III-V*. Translations of Early Documents. Series II: Hellenistic-Jewish Texts, edited by W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918. See the review on this series edited by Oesterley and

Box, by Israel Abrahams, JThS (1920): 179-182.

Ferrar, W. J. "Sibylline Oracles." Uncanonical Jewish Books (1918), pp. 76-81.

Moffatt, J. "Sibylline Oracles." DAC 2 (1918): 477-490.

Bentwich, Norman. "The Hellenistic-Jewish Literature." Hellenism. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1919, pp. 197-245. (Esp. pp. 215-244.)

Kohler, Kaufmann. "Gehenna and Paradise in the Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament." Heaven and Hell in Comparative Religion. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923, pp 59-80, passim. (Esp. pp. 70-74.)

Rzach, Alois. "Zu A. von Gutschmids Sibyllinenstudien." Biblische Zeitfragen, elfte Folge dem hochwürdigsten Herrn Dr. Johannes Nikel ... zu seinem secnzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet von Prof. Dr. Eberharter, et al. Münster in Westfalen: Verlag der Aschandorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923 , pp. 489-501.

Zielinski, Th. La Sibylle, Trois Essais sur la Religion Antique et le Christianisme. Paris: Rieder, 1924.

Rowley, H. H. "The Interpretation and Date of Sibylline Oracles III 388-400." ZAW, N.F., 3 (1926): 324-327.

Frey, J.-B. "La Sibylle juive." DBS 1 (1928): cols. 423-428. See E. Amann, "Les Livres Sibyllins," in the same volume (cols. 530-533) as part of a general survey article: "Apocryphes du Nouveau Testament," cols. 460-533.

Prumm, K. "Das Prophetenamt der Sibyllen in kirchliche Literature." Scholastik; Viertel Jahresschrift für Theologie und Philosophie 4 (Freiburg i. B., 1929): 54-77; 498-533.

Bindley, T. Herbert. "The Sibylline Oracles." Religious Thought in Palestine in the Time of Christ. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1931, pp. 52-56.

Lagrange, M.-J. "Tentatives d'Assimilation Littéraire. 3.--Les Sibylles." Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ (1931), pp. 503-511.

Herford, R. Travers. "The Sibylline Books." Talmud and

Apocrypha (1933), p. 257.

Volz, Paul. "Die sibyllinischen Orakel." *Eschatologie*^{2} (1934), pp. 53-58.

Wolff, M. J. "Sibylla und Sibyllinen." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 25 (Leipzig-Berlin, 1934): 312-325.

Prümm, K. "Seltsame Heilandspropheten. Sibyllen und Sibyllinen: Wahrheit und Irrtum." *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift* 90 (Linz, 1937): 466-475; 618-633. (Esp. pp. 471-475.)

Jeanmaire, Henri. *La Sibylle et le Retour de l'Age d'Or*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1939.

Kurfess, Alfons. "Das Mahngedicht des sogenannten Phokylides im zweiten Buch der Oracula Sibyllina." *ZNW* 38 (1939): 171-181.

Jeanmaire, Henri. "Le règne de la femme des derniers jours et la rajeunissement du monde. Quelques remarques sur le texte de 'Oracula Sibyllina' VIII 190-212." *Mélanges Franz Cumont; Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves, Tome IV (1936); Universite Libre de Bruxelles.* Bruxelles: Secrétariat de l'Institut, 1936, pp. 297-304.

Causse, A. "Le Mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem du Deutéro-Esaïe à la IIIe Sibylle." *RHR* 18 (1938): 377-414.

Bloch, Raymond. "Origines Étrusques des Livres Sibyllins." *Mélanges de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire anciennes offerts à Alfred Ernout . . .* Paris: Libraire C. Klincksieck, 1940, pp. 21-28.

Amann, É. "Sibyllins (Livres)." *DThC*, XIV, 2 (1941): cols. 2027-2032.

Kurfess, Alfons. "Oracula Sibyllina I. II." *ZNW* 40 (1941): 151-165.

Fox, G. George. "Sibylline Books." *UJE* 9 (1943): 525.

Klausner, Joseph. "The Sibylline Oracles." *From Jesus to Paul*. Trans. from the Hebrew by W. F. Stinespring. New York: Macmillan Co., 1943, pp. 143-178.

Youtie, Herbert. "Sambathis." *HThR* 37 (1944): 209-218.

Youtie shows how Sambethe, "the Babylonian sibyl, the voice of the gods," is converted into "a Jewish sibyl" with the necessary "reinterpretation of her name and function within the characteristic canons of Jewish thought." (p. 215)

Torrey, C. C. "The Sibylline Books." *Apocryphal Literature* (1945), pp. 108-110.

Lieberman, Saul. "Palestine in the Third and Fourth Centuries. III. Rabbinic Parallels to the Thirteenth Sibylline Book." *JQR*, n.s., 37 (1947): 31-41. (See *JQR*, n.s., 36 (1946): 329-370, for Lieberman's introductory article which is concluded here.)

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *History of NT Times* (1949), pp. 226-230.
Pfeiffer gives a brief summary of the Oracles. He believes that it is very difficult at times to say whether a passage is Jewish or Christian, since the extant collection of Oracles "was preserved, as well as abundantly edited, by Christians." (p. 226)

Lods, Adolphe. "Oracles Sibyllins." *Histoire de la Littérature* (1950), pp. 896-898.
Lods deals with the Oracles under the broader sectional heading: "Ouvrages de Morale, d'Édification et de Polémique."

Kurfess, Alfons. *Sibyllinische Weissagungen. Urtext und Übersetzung*. München: Tusculum-Bücherei, 1951.

________. "Ad *Oracula Sibyllina* (ed. Geffcken 1902)." *Symbolae Osloenses* 29 (1952): 54-77.

________. "Wie sind die Fragmente der *Oracula Sibyllina* einzuordnen? Ein Beitrag zu [ihrer] Überlieferung ..." *Aevum* 26 (Mailand, 1952): 228-235.

________. "Zu den *Oracula Sibyllina* [XII, 229-44. 256-76. 277-92; XIII, 81-102. 155-71; XIV, 12-17. 318-20. 350-60: emendiert und neu übersetzt]." *Colligere Fragmenta. Festschrift Abban Dold zum 70. Geburtstag am 7.7.1951*, hrsg. von Bonifatius Fischer und Virgil Fiala. Beuron in Hohenzollern: Beuroner Kunstverlag, 1952, pp. 75-83.

Thompson, B. "Patristic Use of the Sibylline Oracles." *RR* 16 (1951-52): 115-136.

Dalbert, Peter. *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur, unter Ansehluss von Philo und Josephus*. Hamburg-Volksdorf: H. Reich, 1954. Originally dissertation, Zurich. For the Oracles, see pp. 106ff.

Kurfess, Alfons. "Juvenal und die Sibylle." *Judaica* 10 (1954): 60-63.

Bauer, J. B."(Κατ) επειγομενοιο Χρονοιο (Or. Sibyll. 3,50; 2, 186), cf. Dan. 9,25." *Hermes*. *Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie* 83 (1955): 250ff.

Kurfess, Alfons. "Oracula Sibyllina XI (IX) -XIV (XII) nicht christlich, sondern jüdisch." *ZRGG* 7 (1955): 270-272. On the basis of content, Kurfess argues for Alexandrian-Jewish authorship.

________. "Vergil's 4. Ekloge und die christlichen Sibyllinen." *Gymnasium* 62 (1955): 110ff.

Klausner, Joseph. "The Sibylline Oracles." *Messianic Idea in Israel* (1955), pp. 370-381.

Bauer, J. B. "Das Sprichwort Orac. Sib. III, 737." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 99 (Frankfurt, 1956): 95-96.

________. "Die Gottesmutter in den OrSib." *Marianum* 18 (1956): 118-124.

________. "Oracula Sibyllina I, 323ab." *ZNW* 47 (1956): 284-285.

Kurfess, Alfons. "Homer und Hesiod im 1. Buch der Oracula Sibyllina." *Philologus* 100 (Berlin-Wiesbaden, 1956): 147-153.

________. "Horaz und die Sibyllinen." *ZRGG* 8 (1956): 253-256.

________. "Zum V. Buch der Oracula Sibyllina." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 99 (Frankfurt, 1956): 225-241.

Bentzen, Aage. "The Sibylline Oracles." *Introduction to OT*^{3} 2 (1957): 241-242.

Kurfess, Alfons. "Dies irae. Zum sog. II. Buch der Oracula Sibyllina." *Historisches Jahrbuch der Gorresgesell-*

schaft 77 (München-Freiburg i. Br., 1958): 328-338.
Kurfess believes that vss. 193-347 of Book II is a Jewish work composed near the end of the first century B.C., and used in the composition of the *Apocalypse of Peter*; cf. in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *NTA*, 2, *Apocalypse of Peter*, ch. 5 (p. 671) and *Sibylline Oracles*, Bk. II, vss. 193ff. (pp. 714-719).

Waxman, Meyer. "The Minor Apocalyptic Works: (3) 'Sibylline Oracles'." *History of Jewish Literature* 1 (1960): 43-44.

Weiser, Artur. "The Sibylline Oracles." *Old Testament: Formation and Development* (1961), pp. 423-425.

Grant, F. C. "Sibyllinen." *RGG*^{3} 6 (1962): cols. 14-15.

Knox, John. "Sibylline Oracles." *IDB* 4 (1962): 343.

Kocsis, E. "Ost-West Gegensatz in den jüdischen Sibyllinen." *NT* 5 (1962): 105-110.

Peretti, Aurelio. "Echi di dottrine esseniche negli Oracoli Sibillini guidaici." *La Parola de Passato* 85 (Neapel, 1962): 247-295.

Glasson, T. F. "Sibylline Oracles." *The Second Advent: The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*. 3rd ed. London: The Epworth Press, 1963, pp. 238-241.

Noack, Bent. "Are the Essenes Referred to in the Sibylline Oracles?" *StTh* 17 (1963): 90-102.
Noack's conclusion is *no*. His final sentence reads: "Thus, the conceptions that remind the modern reader of Essenism, such as the ablutions, the prayers, piety in general, the consciousness of sin &c, are merely, in view of the author, the core of normal Judaism and monotheism." (p. 102)

Rowley, H. H. "The Sibylline Oracles." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 74-77.

Noack, Bent. "Der hervorragende Mann und der Beste der Hebräer (Or. Sib. V, 256-259)." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 3 (Leiden, 1964): 247-295.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Sibylline Oracles." *OT--Introduction* (1965), pp. 615-617.

Kurfess, Alfons. "Apocalyptic Prophecy of the Early Church: 2. Christian Sibyllines." Trans. by R. McL. Wilson. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *NTA* 2 (1965): 703-745.

Riessler, Paul. "Sibyllinische Orakel." *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*^{2} (1966), pp. 1014-45; 1326-28.

"Sibylline Oracles." *EJR* (1966), p. 359.

Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach." *NTS* (1967-68): 551-565.

The author places a great deal of emphasis upon the "Nero Redivivus" myth; cf. Sib. Or. IV, 137ff., and V, 99ff.

Glasson, T. F. "St. Paul, Virgil and the Sibyl." *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* 193 (London, 1968): 70-76.

Glasson regards the twelve extant books of Oracles as "largely Christian," but based on a nucleus of Jewish Oracles dating back to the second century B.C. (p. 72)

Schreiner, Josef. "Die Sibyllinischen Orakel." *Apokalyptik* (2969), pp. 42-45.

Brandon, S. G. F. "Sibylline Oracles." *DCR* (1970), p. 576.

Denis, Albert-Marie. "Les Oracles Sibyllins." *Pseudépigraphes Grecs* (1970), pp. 111-122.

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE XII. PATRIARCHS

Grabe, J. E. (ed.). *Spicilequim SS. Patrum ut et Haereticorum, seculi post Christum natum I. II. & III*, Vol. 1. Oxoniae: [n.n.], 1698, pp. 129-144.

Grosseteste, Robert. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sons of Jacob*. Translated out of Greek into Latine, by R. Grosthead . . . and out of his copy . . . now Englished . . . London: A. Clark, for the Company of Stationers, 1677. Reprinted in 1699.

[Corrodi, Heinrich]. *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, I. Leipzig: [n.n.], 1781, pp. 101-103.

Nitzsch, C. I. *De Testamentis duodecim Patriarchorum libro V. T. Pseudepigrapho*. Wittenberg: ex officina typographica Friderici Immanuelis Siebt., 1810.

Kayser, A. "Die Testamente der XII Patriarchen," *Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften in Verbindung mit der theologischen Gesellschaft zu Strassburg*, 3 (1851): 107-140.

Vorstman, J. M. *Disquisitio de Testamentorum XII Patriarcharum origine et pretio*. Rotterdam: P. C. Hoog, 1857.

Ritschl, Albrecht. *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*. Bonn: Adolph-Marcus, 1850, pp. 324-325. (A second edition appeared 1857.)

Ewald, Heinrich. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*^{2}, 7 (1859): 327-333.

Dorner, J. A. *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. Translated from the 2nd German edition by William Lindsay Alexander. Vol. 1 Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1861, pp. 154-160; 419-422.

Langen, Joseph. *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi. Ein Beitrag zur Offenbarungs- und Religions-Geschichte als Einleitung in die Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1866.

Sinker, Robert. *The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs: An Attempt to Estimate Their Historic and Dogmatic*

Worth. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & Co./London: Bell and Daldy, 1869. (See the review article by Adolf Hilgenfeld, *ZWTh* 14 (1871): 302-305.)

Sinker, Robert. *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum: Appendix Containing a Collation of the Roman and Patmos mss. and Bibliographical Notes*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1879.

Bissell, E. C. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Apocrypha--OT* (1880), p. 671.

Warfield, B. B. "The Apologetical Value of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Presbyterian Review*, 1 (1880): 58-84.

Schnapp, Friedrich. *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen Untersucht*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1884.

Baljon, J. M. S. "De Testamenten der XII Patriarchen," *Theologische Studiën-Utrecht*, IV (1886), 208-231.

Sinker, Robert. "Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum." *DCB* 4 (1887): 865-874.

Deane, William J. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Pseudepigrapha* (1891), pp. 162-192.

Thomson, John E. H. "Post-Christian Apocalypses. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs"; "Critical Notes on Post-Christian Apocalypses--Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Books Which Influenced Our Lord* (1891), pp. 355-359; 458-460.

Zöckler, D. Otto. "Pseudepigraphische Weissagungen in Testamentgestalt (Διαθῆκαι) 3. Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen." *Die Apokryphen des AT* (1891), pp. 473-476.

Conybeare, F. C. "On the Jewish Authorship of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JQR*, o.s., 5 (1892-93): 375-398.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada: A--The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JQR*, o.s., 5 (1893): 399-406. (See also *JQR*, o.s., 8 (1896): 260-268; 471-485; *JQR*, o.s., 12 (1900): 651-661.) Ginzberg, *JBL* 41 (1922): 115-136, rejects altogether Kohler's assessment of the Testaments.

Gaster, M. "The Hebrew Text of One of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," Society of Biblical Archeology: Proceedings, 16-17 (February 1894): 33-49.

Charles, R. H. "The Seven Heavens. An Early Jewish and Christian Belief." ET 7 (1895-96): 57-61; 115-118.
See especially p. 59. Charles cites TLevi, ch. 3, and concludes that the idea of the seven heavens appeared first in Judaism.

Conybeare, F. C. "A Collation of Sinker's Texts of the Testaments of Reuben and Simeon with the Old Armenian Version." JQR, o.s., 8 (1896): 260-168.

________. "A Collation of the Armenian Texts of the Testaments of (1) Judah; (2) Dan; (3) Joseph; (4) Benjamin." JQR, o.s., 8 (1896): 471-485.
This is altogether a list of textual comparisons; there is no discussion of methods or meaning. Cf. JQR, o.s., 12 (1900): 651-661.

Schürer, Emil. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." History 3 (1896): 114-124; Geschichte 3 (1909): 339-356.

Charles, R. H. . "The Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs," Encyclopedia Biblica, (1899): 237-241.

Bousset, Wilhelm. "Die Testamente der XII Patriarchen: I. Die Ausscheidung der christlichen Interpolationen." ZNW 1 (1900): 141-175.

________. "Die Testamente der XII Patriarchen: II. Composition und Zeit der jüdischen Grundschrift." ZNW 1 (1900): 187-209.

________. Ein aramäisches Fragment des Testamentum Levi." ZNW 1 (1900): 344-346.

Conybeare, F. C. "The Testament of Job and the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs," JQR, o.s., 13 (October 1900): 111-127; 258-274.

Pass, H. Leonard, and Arendzen, J. "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi." JQR, o.s., 12 (1900): 651-661.
The authors produce the fragment in efforts similar to Conybeare's (JQR, o.s., 8 (1896): 260-268; 471-485) and Kohler's (JQR, o.s., 5 (1893): 399-406) to show a pre-Christian date and subsequent

Christian interpolation.

Preuschen, Erwin. "Die armenische Übersetzung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen." ZNW 1 (1900): 106-140.
Preuschen gives a German translation of the Armenian version in two recensions.

Schnapp, Friedrich. "Die Testamente der 12 Patriarchen" ("das hebr. Testament Naphthalis" pp. 489ff. von E, Kautzsch), APAT 2 (1900): 458-506.

Conybeare, F. C. "Testament of Job and the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs." JQR, o.s., 13 (1901): 111-127.
A collation of texts. Conybeare gives the Greek text without discussion.

________. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." JQR, o.s., 13 (1901): 258-274.
Conybeare completes in this article the collation of texts begun in the same volume, pp. 111-127; cf. previous citation.

Charles, R. H. "The Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs." HibJ 3 (1904-05): 558-573.

Beer, Georg. RE^3 16 (1905): 253-256.

Strack, Hermann. "Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen." Einleitung AT^2 (1906), p. 179.
Strack classifies the Testaments, along with I Enoch and 4 Ezra as "prophetic Pseudepigraha."

Charles, R. H., and Cowley, A. "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." JQR, o.s., 19 (1907): 566-583.
The authors produce an early Aramaic fragment (the Bodleian) and an English translation of it. This common source of the Greek and Aramaic texts, the authors agree, is not the Testaments, but a work based partly on the Testaments and partly on Jubilees, "or else from a work from which the authors of these books drew some of their materials." (p. 567)

Reid, George J. "II. Apocrypha of Jewish Origin with Christian Accretions.--(b) Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." CathEnc 1 (1907): 606.
This citation is drawn from a larger article which surveys the apocryphal materials. It is cited here not so much because of new insights, but because of his classification of the Testaments.

Sinker, Robert. "The Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs." IJA ix (April, 1907): 12-13.

________. "The Contents of the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs." IJA x (July, 1907): 16.

Charles, R. H. The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Edited From Nine MSS., Together With the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908. Reissued in 1960.

________. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Translated From the Editor's Greek Text, and Edited, With Introduction, Notes, and Indices. London: A. and C. Black, 1908. See the following reviews of Charles's work on the Testaments: RB 5 (1908): 442-445, M.-J. Lagrange; ThT 42 (1908): 429-431, H. Oort; JThS 10 (1908-09): 135-141, F. C. Burkitt; HibJ 8 (1910): 217-221, T. K. Cheyne.

________. "Man's Forgiveness of His Neighbor: A Study in Religious Development," Exp, 7th ser., 6 (1908): 492-505.

________. "Notes on the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs." IJA xii (January, 1908): 14-15.

Plummer, Alfred. "The Relation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs to the Books of the New Testament." Exp, Series 7, 6 (1908): 481-491. (See Charles's rejoinder: Exp, Series 7, 7 (1909): 111-118.)

Andrews, H. T. "The Ethical Teaching of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs." IJA xviii (July, 1909): 63-65.

Charles, R. H. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Relation to the New Testament." Exp, Series 7, 7 (1909): 111-118. (See Plummer's article cited above to which Charles addresses himself in this article.)

Hughes, H. Maldwyn. "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and Christian Ethics." IJA xix (October, 1909): 77-79.

Several parallels between the Testaments and the NT are noted (e.g., Matt. 5:19=TLevi xiii.1; Matt. 6:20=TLevi xiii.5; II Cor. 5:14=TLevi xix.1; Col. 3:5=TJud.xix,1.) in order to demonstrate that Jesus and the early Church, growing out of Jewish soil, reflect common ethical ideas.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JE* 12 (1909): 113-118.

Abbott, E. A. "'Son of Man' in Pre-Christian Usage. 3. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Son of Man* (1910), pp. 58-61. See too pp. 23-118, passim.

Coulange, Louis. "L'Idée Messianique." *RHLR* 13 (1910): 131-143, passim.

Ginzberg, Louis. "The Sons of Jacob." *Legends* 2 (1910): 187-222; 5 (1925): 378-380.

Badham, F. P. "The Title 'Son of Man'." *ThT* 45 (1911): 385-448.

See especially pp. 419-420. Badham concludes that the *Testaments* must be regarded as "Judaeo-Christian," since (although the phrase 'Son of Man' does not actually occur in the Testaments) the language suggests that the editor was acquainted with the phrase in the sense of abasement:--"A man, walking with the sons of men in meekness"; "shall appear in the form of a man of humility."

Beer, Georg. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *NSHE* 9 (1911): 339.

Charles, R. H. "Testaments of the XII Patriarchs." *DB(H)* 4 (1911): 721-725.

Parson, Ernest W. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *BW*, n.s., 37 (1911): 176-188.

Barton, G. A. "The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 A.D." *JBL* 21 (1912): 156-167.

See especially p. 161 where the author describes demons in the Testaments as "simply the personification of the evil propensities of man,--jealousy, lust, pride, chicanery, injustice, rapacity, etc." Quite a contrast to those (e.g., the writer(s) of I Enoch) "who connected these evil spirits with the story of Gen. 6:2-4 . . ."

Leszynsky, R. "Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen: 2. Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen." *Die Sadduzäer* (1912), pp. 237-252.

Charles, R. H. "The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs." *APOT* 2 (1913): 282-367.

Clarke, W. K. Lowther. "St. Luke and the Pseudepigrapha: Two Parallels." *JThS* 15 (1914): 597-599.

Clarke cites parallels between Acts xvi, 23-25 and TJos. viii, 4-5.

Charles, R. H. *Religious Development* (1914), pp. 227-229.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Books of the Apocrypha* (1914), pp. 210-214.

Hunkin, J. W. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JThS* 16 (1915): 80-97.

Hunkin addresses himself to the weaknesses in Charles's reconstruction of the Greek text on the basis of the *a* family of MSS; Hunkin prefers the β family. See deJonge's corroboration of Hunkin's position in an independent investigation in his major volume, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1953, pp. 15-22.

Winstanley, E. W. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as a Guide to Conduct." *IJA* xliii (October, 1915): 61-65.

Charles, R. H. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. With an Introduction by W. O. E. Oesterley. Translations of Early Documents. Series I: Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic). London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

Prideaux, S. P. T. "The New Testament in the Light of the Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." *IJA* li (October, 1917): 56-58.

The author seeks merely to awaken in his readers the feeling of definite relatedness between the NT and the Jewish writings. E.g., he writes: "No one who reads the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs but is struck by the very high ethical standard displayed, and by the numerous expressions which awake memories of the Sermon on the Mount . . ." (p.57)

Ferrar, W. J. "Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs." *Uncanonical Jewish Books* (1918), pp. 73-75.

Messel, Nils. "Über die textkritisch begründete Ausscheidung vermutlicher christlicher Interpolationen in den

Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen." *BZAW* 33 (1918): 355-374.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings." *JBL* 41 (1922): 115-136.

Ginzberg rejects out-of-hand Kohler's idea that the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs held "almost canonical dignity among the Rabbis" (esp. pp. 116ff; cf. Kohler's article cited above, *JQR*, o.s., 5 (1893): 399-406). Ginzberg doubts that the apocalyptic writings spoke to the common people. His summary statement expresses the main point of his article: "The true mirror of the religious life of the Jews we find therefore in the homely and simple sayings and the teachings of the Rabbis and not in the literary productions of the Apocalyptic writers who wrote primarily for a 'class' of men like themselves and not for the people." (p.136)

Sinker, Robert. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* An English Translation with an Introductory Note. Vol. VIII of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926, pp. 1-38.

Weill, J. "Notes de Littérature judeo-hellenistique I. Nephthali et la Règle d'Or ." *Mélanges offerts à M. Israel Lévi par ses Eleves et ses Amis à l'Occasion de son 70^{e} Anniversaire*. Paris: Durlacher, 1926, pp. 125-128.

James, M. R. "The Venice Extracts From the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JThS* 28 (1926-27): 337-348.

Causse, Antonin. "Quelquues Remarques sur l'Idéal ébionitique dans les Testaments des Douze Patriarchs." *RHPhR* (1927): 201-128.

Perles, Felix. "Zur Erklärung von Testament Naphtali 2.8ff." *OLZ* 30 (1927): 83-84.

Causse, Antonin. "L'Idéal ébionitique dans les Testaments des Douze Patriarchs." *Congrès d'Histoire du Christianisme: Jublié Alfred Loisy*, publié sous la direction de P.-L. Couchoud, 3 vols. Paris: Les Éditions Rieder, 1928, Vol. I: 55-76.

Frey, J.-B. "Les Testaments des Douze Patriarches." *DBS* 1 (1928): cols. 380-390.

Hughes, H. M. "The Moral Ideal: Its Content and Development"; "Moral Evil"; "Moral Sanctions." *Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (1928), pp. 51-62; 159-166; 259-262.
Hughes deals with several Jewish writings under each of the above sectional headings; the pages cited focus upon his discussion of the Testaments.

Booth, Henry K. "Messianic Prophecy Between the Testaments." *The Bridge Between the Testaments: A Survey of the Life and Literature of the Period of the Connections*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929, pp. 189-200.
Several parallels are cited (e.g., TLevi 18:11=Rev. 2:7; TJos. 1:5-6=Matt. 25:35-36) which indicate the powerful influence of this literature upon the NT writers.

Kohler, Kaufmann. *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929, pp. 185-186.

Eppel, R. *Le Piétisme juif dans les Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. Paris: Alcan, 1930. (See the following reviews: J. Bonsirven, *RSR* 21 (1931): 508-511; B. Violet, *ThLZ* 56 (1931): 313-315; L. Finkelstein, *JQR*, n.s., 23 (1932-33): 382-383.)

Bindley, T. Herbert. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Religious Thought in Palestine in the Time of Christ*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1931, pp. 48-52.

Greitemann, Nicolaas. "De Messia eiusque Regno in Testamento duodecim Patriarcharum." *VD* 11 (1931): 156-160.

Lagrange, M.-J. "L'Apocalyptique sous les Premiers Asmonéens: 5.--Les Testaments des Douze Patriarches." *Le Judaïsme Avant Jésus-Christ* (1931), pp. 122-130.

Herford, R. Travers. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Talmud and Apocrypha* (1933), pp. 233-243.

Volz, Paul. "Die Testamente der Patriarchen." *Eschatologie*^{2} (1934), pp. 30-33.

Manson, T. W. "God as King: The Final Consummation." *The Teaching of Jesus* (1935), pp. 244-284, passim.

Munch, P. A. "The Spirits in the Testaments of the Twelve

Patriarchs." *Acta Orientalia* 13 (Copenhagen, 1935): 257-263.

Meyer, R. "Levitische Emanzipationsbestrebungen in nachexilischer Zeit." *OLZ* 41 (1938): 721-728.

Torrey, C. C. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Apocryphal Literature* (1945), pp. 129-131.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JThS* 48 (1947): 1-12.

Manson, T. W. "Miscellanea Apocalyptica III: Text. XII Patr." Levi viii." *JThS* 48 (1947): 59-61.

Uricchio, N. "De Lege et Messia in ordine ad iustificationem in „Testamentis XII Patriarcharum“." *VD* 26 (1948): 98-103; 152-162; 304-309.

Black, Matthew. "The Messiah in the Testament of Levi xviii." *ET* 60 (1948/49): 321-322; 61 (1949/50): 157-158.

Black's first article brought forth a rejoinder from J. R. Porter (see the article cited below); to this, Black responds in his second article.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *History of NT Times* (1949), pp. 64-66.

See too p. 188, where Pfeiffer speaks of the noble moral ideal of Judaism and its serving as the foundation for the ethical system of Christianity. He illustrates this relationship by pointing out parallels between the Testaments and the Sermon on the Mount.

Porter, J. R. "The Messiah in the Testament of Levi xviii." *ET* 61 (1949/50): 90-91.

In this article Porter responds to a study under the same title by Matthew Black, *ET* 60 (1948/49): 321-322. In a later article, *ET* 61 (1949/50): 157-158, Black answered Porter.

Bickerman, E. J. "The Date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JBL* 69 (1950): 245-260.

Lods, Adolphe. "Les Testaments des Douze Patriarches." *Histoire de la Littérature* (1950), pp. 818-824.

Peterson, Erik. "Das Schiff als Symbol der Kirche: Die Tat des Messias im eschatologischen Meeressturm in der jüdischen und altchristlichen Überlieferung."

ThZ 6 (1950): 77-79. (Significant for TNaph. ch. 6.)

Daniélou, Jean. "Les Sources juives de la Doctrine des Anges des Nations chez Origène." *RSR* 38 (1951): 132-137. (TNaphth.)

Argyle, A. W. "The Influence of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Upon the New Testament." *ET* 63 (1951/52): 256-258.

Argyle defends Charles's basic position of NT dependence upon the Testaments. Cf. the response by T. C. Fenton, *ET* 64 (1952/53): 124-125.

Dupont-Sommer, André. "Le Testament de Lévi (XVII-XVIII) et la Secte juive de l'Alliance." *Sem* 4 (1951/52): 33-53.

Botha, F. J. "*ʿUmâs* in Luke xii, 31." *ET* 64 (1952/53): 125.

A response to Argyle (see citation above) regarding TBen. 3:3. Cf. Fenton's argument against Argyle's methodology in the article cited next.

Fenton, T. C. "Rare Words in the Bible." *ET* 64 (1952/53): 124-125.

Fenton demonstrates the absurdity of Argyle's argument concerning the relationship of the NT to the Testaments on the basis of the occurence of "rare words."

Rabin, C. "The Teacher of Righteousness in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JJS* 3 (1952): 127-128.

Discusses TBen. ix.2, "an only-begotten prophet (monogenous prophetou)."

Flusser, David. "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect." *IEJ* 3 (1953): 30-47.

For the study of the Testaments, Flusser's article has no specific significance. A casual observation which Flusser makes, however, is interesting: he suggests that books like Enoch, Jubilees, and the Testaments show interdependence (i.e., possess common ideas and even quote from one another), but they "provide no evidence of having originated in a tightly-organized religious community such as is reflected in the writings of the Dead Sea sect proper, . . ." (p. 38)

Higgins, A. J. B. "Priest and Messiah." *VT* 3 (1953): 321-336.

Higgins compares the idea of a "priestly

Messiah" (citing the Testaments as an example) and the NT conception and concludes that the resemblances "are really quite superficial." (p. 334)

Jonge, Marianus de. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin.* Assen, Netherlands: Koninklijde Van Gorcum & Comp., N. V., 1953.

See the following reviews: Jean Danielou, *RSR* 43 (1955): 563-567; Robert M. Grant, *VigChr* 9 (1955): 185-186; J. T. Milik, *RB* 62 (1955): 297-298; A. J. B. Higgins, *SJTh* 8 (1955): 198-199; J. W. Doeve, *NedThT* 9 (1954): 49-52; Otto Eissfeldt, *ThLZ* 79 (1954): cols. 477-478; D. R. Jones, *Theology* 57 (1954): 390-392; H. F. D. Sparks, *JThS*, n.s., 6 (1955): 287-290.

Otzen, Benedikt. "Die neugefunderen hebräischen Sektenschriften und die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen." *StTh* 7 (1953): 125-157.

Bammel, Ernest von. Ἀρχιερεὺς Προφητεύων, *ThLZ* 79 (1954): cols. 351-356. (Esp. col. 353, TLevi, ch. 8.)

Dupont-Sommer, André. "The Testament of Levi and the Teacher of Righteousness." The Jewish Sect of *Qumran and the Essenes.* Trans. by R. D. Barnett. London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., Ltd., 1954, pp. 38-57. (See *Semitica* 4 (1952): 33-53, for the author's detailed study which is summarized in the work cited here.)

Leivestad, Ragnar. "Tendensen i De Tolv Patriarkers Testamenter." *Norsk teologisk Tidsskrift* 55 (Olso, 1954): 103-123.

Vagaggini, L. "Testamenti XII." *Études et Commentaires* 12 (Paris, 1954): 19ff.

Aschermann, Hartmut. "Die paränetischen Formen der “Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen” und ihr Nachwirken in der frühchristlichen Mahnung. Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung." Diss. theol. (Masch.) Berlin, 1955. (See abstract in *ThLZ* 81 (1956): cols. 480-481.)

Barthelemy, D., and Milik, J. T., With Contributions by R. de Vaux and Others. *Qumran Cave I.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955, pp. 87-91.

In the section cited, the authors briefly discuss the significance of recently discovered fragments of an Aramaic TLevi and a Hebrew TNaphtali.

Grelot, P. "Le Testament araméen de Lévi est-il traduit de l'Hébreu?" *REJ* 114 [n.s. 14] (1955): 91-99.

Klausner, Joseph. "The Testaments of the Twelve Tribes." *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (1955), pp. 310-316.

Kuhn, K. G. "Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels." *NTS* 1 (1955): 168-179.

Milik, J. T. "Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen; Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân [with facsimile]." *RB* 62 (1955): 398-406, pl. IV.

Stenzel, M. "Altlateinische Canticatexte im Dodekapropheton." *ZNW* 46 (1955): 31-60.

Argyle, A. W. "Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching." *ET* 67 (1956): 199-201.

Grelot, Pierre. "Notes sur le Testament Araméen de Lévi (Fragment de la Bodlein Library, colonne a)." *RB* 63 (1956): 391-406.

LaSor, W. S. "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." *VT* 6 (1956): 425-429.

Brownlee, W. H. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament." *NTS* 3 (1956-57): 12-30; 194-210.

See especially p. 197, where "salvation" is pictured as "a messianic title in the Testaments" (e.g., TNaph. viii.2; TGad. viii.1; TDan.v.10; TJos. xix.11). The author also discusses briefly the idea of "double messianism" (a messiah from both Judah and Levi); pp. 203ff. gives brief attention to the messianic idea in TLevi xviii.2ff. (Cf. *ET* 60 (1948/49): 321-322.)

Bentzen, Aage. "The Testaments of the Twelve." *Introduction to OT*^{3} 2 (1957): 249.

Galling, Kurt. "Belial." *RGG*^{3} 1 (1957): cols. 1025-26.

Nauck, Wilhelm. *Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes: zugleich ein Beiträge zur Taufe im Urchristentum und in der alten Kirche*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 3. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957. (Esp. pp. 171-

173, TLevi.)

Schubert, Kurt. "Die Messiaslehre in den Testamenten der 12 Patriarchen im Lichte der Texte von Chirbet Qumran." *Akten des vierundzwanzigsten Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses München 28. August bis 4. September 1957*. Wiesbaden, 1959, pp. 197-198.

________. "*Testamentum Juda 24* im Lichte der Texte von Chirbet Qumran." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morganlandes* 53 (Wein, 1957): 227-236.

Woude, A. S. van der. "Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen." *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1957, pp. 190-216. (See the review by J. van der Ploeg, *Vox Theologica* 29 (1958): 56-58.)

Jansen, H. L. "The Consecration in the Eighth Chapter of Testamentum Levi." *Studies in the History of* Religions (*Supplements to Numen*) IV. *The Sacral Kingship. Contributions to the Central Theme of VIIIth International Congress for the History of Religions* (Rome, April 1955). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959, pp. 356-365.

Audet, J. P. *La Didachè; Instructions des Apôtres*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958, pp. 160-161.

Audet tries to show that textual criticism of the Testaments is of limited value for the study of their history. Cf. the study by de Jonge, *NT* 5 (1962): 311-319.

Chevallier, Max Alain. "l'Esprit et le Messie dans les Testaments des Douze Patriarches et dans les Écrits de Qumran." *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament*. Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, N. 49. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958, pp. 111-144.

Kuhn, H. W. "Die beiden Messias in den Qumrantexten und die Messiasvorstellung in der rabbinischen Literatur." *ZAW* 70 (1958): 200-208.

Kosmala, H. *Hebräer-Essener-Christen; Studien zur Vorgeschichte der fruhchristlichen Verkündigung*. Studia Post-Biblica, Bd. 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959, pp. 81-91.

The author believes that the Testaments originated in the circles to which the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed. He discusses the relationship between the two works.

Jonge, M. de. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament." *Studia Evangelica*; Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" Held at Oxford, 1957. Edited by Kurt-Aland, F. L. Cross, *et al*. (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Bd. 73). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag GmbH, 1959, pp. 546-556.

Liver, J. "The Doctrine of Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth." *HThR* 52 (1959): 149-185.

Liver concludes that the doctrine in the Testaments of the XII is the same as that of the DSS.

Milik, J. T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. Trans. by J. Strugnell. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 26. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959, pp. 34-35.

From the repetition of literary form and definite Christian elements, Milik suggests a Christian origin for the Testaments.

Peterson, Erik. "Das Schiff als Symbol der Kirche in der Eschatologie." *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis. Studien und Untersuchungen*. Rome: Herder, 1959, pp. 92-96.

A fresh statement of Peterson's earlier article: *ThZ* 6 (1950): 77-79.

Prigent, P. "Quelques Testimonia messianiques; leur Histoire littéraire de Qoumran aux Peres de l'Eglise." *ThZ* 15 (1959): 419-430.

Gnilka, Joachim. "Die Erwartung des messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament." *RdQ* 2 (1959/60): 395-426. (See esp. pp. 405-408.)

Braun, F. M. "Les Testaments des XII Patriarches et le Problème de Leur Origine." *RB* 68 (1960): 516-549. (Cf. de Jonge's response to Braun's article: *NT* 5 (1962): 311-319.)

Jonge, M. de. "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the

Twelve Patriarchs." NT 4 (1960): 182-235.
De Jonge lists passages and debates with the views of both Philonenko (see citation below) and van der Woude, Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran, 1957, pp. 190-216. Cf. Ploeg, J. van der. "The Meals of the Essenes." JSSt 2 (1957): 163-175. De Jonge refers to this article when he says that the Qumran writings so far published do not "allow us to speak of an Essene equivalent of the Christian celebration of the Holy Supper." See Philonenko's discussion of various texts in his attempt to show such an equivalent: e.g., TSim. vi,7; TAsher vii,3; TJud. xxiv, 1.

Larsson, E. "Qumranlitteraturen och De tolv patriarkernas testamenten." Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 25 (Uppsala-Lund, 1960): 109-118.

Philonenko, Marc. Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les manuscrits de Qoumrân. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960.
Appeared first as two articles: RHPhR 38 (1958): 309-343; 39 (1959): 14-38. Cf. de Jonge's summary and criticism of Philonenko's position: NT 4 (1960): 182-235. See the following reviews of Philonenko's volume: S. G. F. Brandon, HibJ 59 (1960-61): 188-189; Jean Danielou, RSR 48 (1960): 595-598; G. Fohrer, ZAW 72 (1960): 301-302.

Schwartz, J. "Du Testament de Lévi au Discours véritable de Celse." RHPhR 40 (1960): 126-145.

Waxman, Meyer. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." History of Jewish Literature 1 (1960): 34-36.

Dupont-Sommer, André. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." The Essene Writings From Qumran. Trans. by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961, pp. 295-305.

Weiser, Artur. "The Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs." Old Testament: Formation and Development (1961), pp. 442-445.

Gnilka, Joachim von. "Der Hymnus des Zacharias (f) Die Zwölf-Patriarchen-Testamente ," BZ, N.F., 6 (1962): 235-238.

Jonge, M. de. "Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Patriarchs." NT 5 (1962): 311-319.

In this article de Jonge responds to Braun, *RB* 68 (1960): 516-549.

Rost, L. "Testamente der XII Patriarchen." *RGG*^{3} 6 (1962): cols. 701-702.

Smith, Morton. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The." *IDB* 4 (1962): 575-579.

Vawter, Bruce. "Levitical Messianism and the NT." *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought, Gruenthaner Memorial Volume*. Edited by J. L. McKenzie. St. Mary's Theological Studies 1. New York: Herder and Herder, 1962, pp. 83-99.

Gnilka, Joachim von. "2 Kor. 6, 14-7,1 im Lichte der Qumranschriften und der Zwölf-Patriarchen-Testamente." *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburstag*. Hrsg. von J. Blinzer, O. Kuss, F. Mussner. Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1963, pp. 86-99. (Esp. pp. 90-92, 97.)

Rowley, H. H. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Relevance* (1963), pp. 68-74.

Charles, R. H. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Eschatology* (Reissued, 1963), pp. 224-234.

Foerster, Werner. "The Essene Movement and Apocalyptic." *From the Exile to Christ, A Historical Introduction to Palestinian Judaism*. Trans. by Gordon E. Harris from the 3rd revised German edition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964, pp. 74-81.

de Jonge, M. W. C. *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum, Edited According to Cambridge University Library Ms. Ff. I.24, fol. 203a-262b. With Short Notes.* Vol. I of *Pseudepigraphica Veteris Testamenti Graece*, edited by A. M. Denis and M. de Jonge. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. (See the reviews by Burchard, *RdQ* 5 (1964-66): 281-284, and Sparks, *JThS*, n.s., 17 (1966): 128-129.)

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs." *OT--Introduction* (1965), pp. 631-636.

Burchard, Christoph. "Neues zur Überlieferung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen. Eine unbeachtete griechische Handschrift (Athos, Laura I 48) und eine unbekannte neugriechische Fassung (Bukarest, Bibl. Acad. 580

[341])." *NTS* 12 (1966): 245-258.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Das Lamm, das aus der Jungfrau hervorging (Test. Jos. 19,8)." *ZNW* 57 (1966): 216-219.

Riessler, Paul. "Testament der zwölf Patriarchen." *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*^{2} (1966), pp. 1149-1250; 1335-38.

"Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *EJR* (1966), p. 381.

Higgins, A. J. B. "The Priestly Messiah," *NTS*, 13 (1966-67): 211-239.

Borsch, F. H. "II Esdras, II Enoch, The Testament of Levi, Etc." *Son of Man in Myth and History* (1967), pp. 156-167. (For TLevi, see esp. pp. 162-167; 199-200.)

Hooker, Morna D. "Son of Man and Related Concepts in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Term "Son of Man" and Its Use in St. Mark's Gospel.* Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967, pp. 49-74. (Esp. 66-67: "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.")

Kuhn, K. H. "An English Translation of the Sahidic Version of the Testament of Isaac." *JThS*, n.s., 18 (1967), 325-336.

Stone, M. E. "The Testament of Jacob MS 939 Armenian Convent of St. James in Jerusalem=Test. XII Patr. armeniace ." *Revue des Études Armeniennes* 5 (Paris, 1968): 261-270.

Stone, Michael E. *The Testament of Levi. A First Study of the Armenian MSS of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs in the Convent of St. James, Jerusalem. With Text, Critical Apparatus, Notes and Translation.* Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1969.

Jonge, M. de. A review of Stone's *Testament of Levi*, *JSJ* 1 (1970): 195-196.

Eltester, Walther (ed.). *Studien zu den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen.* *BZAW* 36. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1969. (See the review by M. E. Stone, *JBL* 89 (1970): 487-488.)

Burchard, Christoph. "Zur armenischen Überlieferung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen," pp. 1-29.

Jervell, Jacob. "Ein Interpolator interpretiert. Zu den christlicher Bearbeitung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen," pp. 30-61.

Thomas, Johannes. "Aktuelles im Zeugnis der zwölf Väter," pp. 62-150.

Schreiner, Josef. "Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen." *Apokalyptik* (1969), pp. 37-42.

Klijn, A. F. J. A Review of Burchard-Jervell-Thomas, *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen*. *BZAW*, 36. *JSJ* 1 (1970): 85.

Haupt, Detlev. "Das Testament Levi. Untersuchungen zu seiner Entstehung und Überlieferungsgeschichte." Diss. Halle-Wittenberg, 1969.

Haupt feels that "a Christian redactor" is responsible for IV 1, 4bc, 6; X 2-3; XIV 1,2; VIII 11b; XVI 3,5; XVIII 8-14, plus the rewriting of XVIII 2-7. See the review by M. de Jonge, *JSJ* 1 (1970): 191.

Stone, M. E. "The Jerusalem Manuscripts of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Samples of Text." *Sion*, Official Publication of the Armenian Patriarchate, Jerusalem. A Bimonthly of Religion, Literature and Philology, 1970, 1-7. (See: *IEJ*, 19 (1969), 20-43.)

Becker, Jurgen. *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*. Band VIII of: *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums*. Edited by Otto Michel and Martin Hengel. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Jonge, M. de. A review of Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungesgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, Brill, 1970, *JSJ*, 1 (1970): 187-188.

Denis, Albert-Marie. "Les Testaments des XII Patriarchs." *Pseudépigraphes Grecs* (1970), pp. 49-59.

Jonge, M. de. A review of A.-M. Denis, *Introduction aux Pseud. grecs* . . . *JSJ* 1 (1970): 190-191.

Fiedler, Martin Johannes. " Δικαιοσύνη in der diasporajüdischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur." *JSJ* 1 (1970): 120-143. (See esp. Section 2. "Die

palästina-jüdischen Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen," pp. 134-142.)

Turdeanu, Emile. "Les Testaments des Douze Patriarches en Slave." JSJ 1 (1970): 148-184.

PART II

METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

CHAPTER I

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH

The study of the Ascension of Isaiah has been hampered by the lack of serious critical studies and the subsequent relegation of the book to a brief "summary" or "introductory" type of treatment, usually as part of an overall survey of apocalyptic writings.[1] Despite these limitations in the available literature, the majority of writers have detected the crucial question to which every reader of the Ascension is inevitably brought by the structure of the text itself: namely, the question of the origin and development of the text; the question of its Jewish/Christian structure.

It was in the works of August Dillmann (1877)[2] and R. H. Charles (1900)[3] that detailed critical investigations of the Ascension of Isaiah were first undertaken. Both of these scholars postulated an original Jewish writing which was subsequently reworked by Christian authors through a process of interpolation and editorial combination of Jewish and Christian documents. The purpose of such reworking was to convert the original Jewish document into a writing which could be used as "Christian" literature. (This conversion feature is not necessarily characteristic of the redaction process in general; in some cases the purpose may have been simply enlargement for the sake of emphasis or clarity rather than doctrinal change.) Although the lines of discussion moved in several directions both before and after the established norm which came to be associated with the conclusions of Dillmann and Charles, the question of the development of the text was still central. For example, Laurence (1819) saw the Ascension text as a composition by a Jew who had been converted to Christianity;[4] wheras, Ewald (1868) envisioned a three-stage development in the composition which he believed to be Christian and which only in its final stage incorporated the Jewish narrative of Isaiah's death.[5] Both Laurence and Ewald assumed the Christian origin of the text and believed the Christian writers had used preexisting Jewish materials. Even after the critical works of Dillmann and Charles, there were other scholars who still maintained that the Ascension text was of Christian origin--from start to finish. F. C. Burkitt (1919) argued for the unity of the text on the basis of the theological intent of the author;[6] Vacher Burch (1919 and 1920) drew the same conclusion on the basis of a common literary source for the various sections of the text.[7] Although none of these authors advocated an interpolation theory but, rather, argued for a unified composition, which they believed to be of Christian origin, their conclusions, nonetheless, rested upon certain assessments of the makeup of the Ascension text. Moreover, in the case of later interpreters such as Burkitt and Burch, another factor played a major role: their consideration of and reactions to the conclusions set forth by scholars such as Dillmann and Charles.

---

[1] See the discussion of the limitations in the literature, pp. 9-11 of this dissertation.

[2] Ascensio Isaiae (Lipsiae: F. A. Brockhaus, 1877).

[3] The Ascension of Isaiah (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900.)

---

[4] R. Laurence, Ascensio Isaiae Vatis (Oxoniae: J. Parker, 1819), pp. 141-180.

[5] Heinrich Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Zweiter Aufgabe, Bd. 7 (Göttingen: In der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung, 1859), pp. 334-337.

Our discussion of the Ascension of Isaiah will proceed in the following way. To begin, representative positions regarding the Ascension text held by scholars prior to the Dillmann-Charles era are sketched as the background out of which eventually emerged the redaction/interpolation theory. Second, the interpolation theory developed in the studies of Dillmann and Charles is summarized. Most studies of the Ascension text (before and after Dillmann and Charles have to be viewed in the light of the norm which came to be associated with the works of these two men. Then, from this central position, the discussion encompasses the conclusions set forth by scholars who came after Dillmann and Charles, and who differed with and wrote in reaction to their position.[8]

---

[6] Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (London: Oxford University Press, 1914).

[7] "The Literary Unity of the Ascensio Isaiae." JThS 20 (1919): 17-23; "Material for the Interpretation of the Ascensio Isaiae." JThS 21 (1920): 249-265.

The Directions of Critical Research

Pre-critical assumptions

Richard Laurence,[9] who first edited the Ethiopic text of the Ascension of Isaiah in 1819, evidently saw no major issue in the question of the origin of the text. Since both Jewish and Christian elements were easily recognized in the text, the question had to be answered. To Laurence the answer was as evident from the makeup of the text as was the question: the author was a Jew who had been converted to the Christian faith. That the author was a Jew was clearly apparent in his facility in handling the Jewish materials:

---

[8] It is neither within the purpose nor scope of this study to give a complete history of research on the Ascension text. The survey is representative of the major critical shifts in this history. For a complete survey of critical inquiries the following are helpful: Eugène Tisserant, *Ascension d'Isaie* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1909) pp. 42-61; R. H. Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, London, 1900, pp. xxxiv-sliii; William J. Deane, *Pseudepigrapha* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891), pp. 236-275. A brief summary of the major literature and history is also given in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* 2 (At the Clarendon Press, 1913). Further citations will be *APOT*, 2.

[9] The resumé of Laurence's approach to this question is taken primarily from Tisserant, *Ascension d' Isaie*, pp. 42-43. Cf. Stokes, *DCB* 3 (1877): 298-301, who points out that all of Laurence's evidence is based on chs. 1-5 of the Ascension text.

i.e., (1) the tradition of the death of Isaiah which was of Jewish origin; (2) the idea of seven heavens which belonged to Jewish speculation; and (3) the use of the ancient rabbinic "Sammaël" to designate Satan. The "Christian elements" of chapters VI-XI sufficiently proved his conversion to Christianity.

To the extent that Laurence recognized the use of preexisting Jewish materials, it may be incorrect to judge his analysis to be mere "pre-critical assumptions."[10] His approach to the text, however, can in no way be compared to the more sophisticated, critical techniques employed by Dillmann (1877) and Charles (1900)--techniques which unhesitatingly sought to separate the Jewish and Christian segments, to recognize the chronological confusion in the narrative, and to bracket-out the editorial patchwork which indicated efforts at fusing quite independent and, originally, unrelated elements.

Charles had written in 1900 that "all writers on the Ascension, save Laurence, recognize a plurality of authorship".[11] Charles had apparently forgotten Thomson's work (Books Which Influenced Our Lord, 1891)[12] which he listed, without comment, in his survey of critical inquiries, and he probably could not have envisioned the possibility that the issue would ever again be considered an open one by any legitimate critical scholarship. There were nonetheless later challenges to the position set out by Charles, as we shall see under section III of our discussion. Those who challenged the generally accepted interpolation theory, and who argued for the literary unity of the Ascension, posited--though obviously on the basis of different evidence--almost the same simple solution as that of Laurence.

---

[10] Cf. Deane, Pseudepigrapha, pp. 249ff.

[11] Charles, Ascension of Isaiah, p. xxxvi.

[12] John E. H. Thomson, Books Which Influenced Our Lord (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891), pp. 340-348; 451-455.

An emerging critical awareness

When Gesenius wrote his Commentar über den Jesaia[13] only two years after Laurence's work on the Ethiopic text of the Ascension, he became the first to distinguish two separate parts: chs. 1-5 and chs. 6-11. In this recognition, Gesenius did not depart radically from Laurence's one-author solution. Although scholars agree on this basic division of the text, with variations as to the extent of the interpolations, the two sections generally are designated respectively as of Jewish and Christian origin.[14] Gesenius interpreted this entire first section (chs. 1-5) in the light of 3:13-5:1, which scholars now agree to be a later interpolation and concluded that the author, "a judaizing Christian,"[15] was devoted to the "chiliastic hope" and had only one purpose: to set forth his expectation of the approaching return of the Christ. Gesenius gave only slight notice to the second section, chs. 6-11. He distinguished it from the first section and presumed it to be of Christian origin also.[16] Its purpose was to praise the glory of the saints and martyrs represented as angels in the sixth heaven. It is not clear from Gesenius's discussion whether or not he envisioned a common authorship for both parts of the text or a plurality of authors.[17] What is clear from Gesenius is this: the Ascension text is made up of two distinctive sections, each having its own purpose and emphasis, each written at different times and, therefore, originally independent of

---

[13] Wilhelm Gesenius, Commentar über den Jesaia. Zweyten Theiles. (Leipzig: by Friedr. Christ. Wilh. Vogel., 1931), pp. 45-56. See the resumé given by Tisserant, Ascension d'Isaie, pp. 43-44.

[14] This is almost universally accepted in scholarship today and is a part of almost every summary of "critical research" on the Ascension. E.g., "Isaiah, Ascension of,"

EJR (1966), p. 204; Paul Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schriftum ausserhalb der Bibel, übersetzt und erlautert*. 2. Auflage. (Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1966) pp. 1300-1301; Artur Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton (New York: Association Press, 1961) pp. 419-420.

[15] Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaia*, pp. 50-53. The judaizing tendency is manifested by the use of the Jewish legend of the Martyrdom, and other features--e.g., the fact that Isaiah's persecutor was a Samaritan (p. 53).

[16] Ibid. Gesenius is not clear at this point; the fact of Christian origin, however, seems to be assumed.

[17] Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. xxxiv ff., interpreted Gesenius's position as indicative of two independent authors.

each other.

Further advances were made into the understanding of the composition and nature of our present text of the Ascension in the work of Gieseler and Ewald. Gieseler,[18] like Gesenius before him, divided the text into two distinctive sections: chs. 1-5 and 6-11. His radical departure from Gesenius's earlier and similar division, was his designation of the two sections as two independent writings, *of Jewish and Christian origin respectively*. This insight provided the foundation upon which further critical inquiry would build.

Ewald, in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israels* (1868),[19] was the first to distinguish the works of three different authors within the text of the Ascension; it was this insight which was later to play a key role in the position of both Dillmann and Charles. Even though Ewald still spoke of the Ascension, in each of its three independent parts as well as in its final composite form, in terms of Christian authorship, his critical perceptiveness regarding the makeup of the text was decisive for subsequent scholarship.

---

[18] Jo. Car. Lud. Gieseler, *Vetus translatio latina Visionis Jesaiae, libri V.T. pseudepigraphi* (Cottingae: Typis Dieterichianis, 1832). This volume is usually cited *Göttinger Pfingstprogramm*.

[19] 2te Aufgabe, Bd. 7, pp. 334-337; 3 Aufgabe, 1868, pp. 369-373.

Ewald's analysis may be summarized in the following manner. (1) At the base of the Ascension lay chs. 6:1-11:1, 23-40, composed by a Christian late in the first decade of the second century. (2) Sometime later, another Christian added the narrative of Christ and his church, 9:2-22; 3:13-4:22; it is this narrative placed in the mouth of the prophet which can be properly called the "vision of Isaiah." (3) Another Christian author, still later, in an effort to tighten the links of the different parts, added the ancient account of the death of Isaiah, 1;1-3, 12; 5:1-16; 11:41-43. Ewald suggested that this third author certainly must have known and used "ein älteres Judäisches Buch" which contained this tradition; his use of the tradition, however, was awkward and clumsy.[20] In distinguishing the marks of the three authors, Ewald emphasized the names used for the demons: i.e., the oldest source used the simplest name "Satan" (cf. 7:9, 12; 9:14; 10:12; 11:23), while the second preferred "Sammaël" or (as in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs) "Belial," and the third author added the new name "Malkira."[21]

---

[20] 2te Aufgabe, p. 337. Cf. Weiser, The OT: Its Formation and Development, 1961, who recognized that the various narratives were "only with difficulty brought into connection with each other" (p. 419). This obvious awkwardness within the text becomes the greatest obstacle in the path of those who advocate "a literary unity" for the document.

[21] Ibid. See note 3, pp. 336-337.

When Ewald's analysis is compared with its later revised form used by both Dillmann and Charles, the differences are less obvious than at first they appeared to be, and, in general, become a matter of *the approach* to the text.[22] Dillmann and those who have accepted, for the most part, his analysis (Harnack, Schürer, Deane, and Beer)[23] and Charles, who differed only slightly in his handling of the text, all regarded the Martyrdom narrative (again, with slight variations in the limits each allowed to the extent of the narrative) as an earlier, independent, Jewish work; so did Ewald. Dillmann and Charles both began with the *Vorlage* of this narrative which was presumably taken over, reworked by interpolation and redaction, and used (for propaganda purposes?) by an early Christian community. At this point, Ewald's approach to the makeup of the text differed radically. Dillmann and Charles believed the Martyrdom was the original Jewish narrative. Ewald saw the Martyrdom as Jewish material which was used, almost incidentally, by the third Christian author who attempted to give unity to what two previous writers had already done. A closer examination of Charles's final summary reveals the fundamental difference between his position and Ewald's. The radical distinction is one of chronology; a distinction which becomes crucial in the study of textual development. What is earlier for one (Ewald) is later for the other (Charles) in terms of its inclusion into the text as it now stands. Whereas Ewald saw a gradual building of the text in three separate stages (the third being the addition of already existing Jewish materials regarding Isaiah's death), Charles found a satisfactory answer to the problems posed by the text by envisioning "a single editor" who had at his disposal three independent works: the Martyrdom narrative of Jewish origin, and two independent Christian works, the Testament of Hezekiah and the Vision of Isaiah.[24]

---

[22] See pp. 156-167 of this dissertation for a summary of the positions of Dillmann and Charles.

[23] Adolf Harnack, *ThLZ* 3 (1878): Cols. 78-80, *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* 1 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1893); 854-856; 2 (1897): 573-579-714-716; Emil Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. 2nd rev. ed. Trans. by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. Second Division, Vol. 3 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), pp. 141-146; Deane, *Pseudepigrapha*, pp. 236-275; G. Beer, *RE*^{3} 16 (1905): 260-262; *NSHE* 9 (1911): 340-341; *APAT* 2 (1900): 119-127.

The Position of A. Dillmann and R. H. Charles: The "Interpolation Theory"

The most clearly established and generally recognized position concerning the composite nature of the text of the Ascension of Isaiah came from August Dillmann (1877) and R. H. Charles (1900).[25] Although these men were not the first to examine the Ascension text, their conclusions regarding its structure have been looked upon as "normative" by apocrypha and pseudepigrapha scholars, with few exceptions. Moreover, the major literature on the Ascension reflects an awareness of the interpolation theory and generally registers either agreement with and dependence upon Charles (who has moved beyond Dillmann in several respects) or reaction to his position. Our task is to explore briefly this interpolation theory, which has become central in the Ascension research. From this central point, the discussion will then summarize and assess the later reactions to Charles's theory.

---

[24] Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah, pp. xxxvi-xliii; esp. p. xliii, for the gist of his analysis. This brief recapitulation is cited in full in APOT 2: 157, and quoted by Tisserant, Ascension d'Isaie, p. 56.

[25] Dillmann, Ascensio Isaiae; Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah.

August Dillmann, Ascensio Isaiae (1877)

Dillmann's position with regards to the Ascension is described by both Charles and Tisserant as a "remodelled" or "modified" version of Ewald's earlier analysis.[26] Dillmann moved beyond Ewald at several points. In the first place, he saw in the history of the text four consecutive stages instead of three. Moreover, Dillmann believed the "Martyrdom of Isaiah" was the original Jewish composition subsequently interpolated by a Christian writer, rather than the last stage of composition, as Ewald had envisioned it. Further, rather than one work which was enlarged in three stages of composition, Dillmann posited the idea of at least two separate, independent documents--the Martyrdom (Jewish) and the Vision (Christian)--which were in subsequent stages joined together, redacted, and interpolated.

---

[26] Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah, pp. xxxviff.; APOT 2: 156-157. Charles says Dillmann's analysis is superior in some respects and inferior in others to that of Ewald; he does not elaborate on this point; Tisserant, Ascension d'Isaie, pp. 46-48; Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2 Aufgabe, Bd. 7, 1859.

Dillmann's analysis can be summarized in the following manner.[27]

I. The Martyrdom of Isaiah narrative, of Jewish origin.--2:1-3:12, and 5:2-14. Dillmann described this piece as a midrash, placed significance on the Jewish names encountered here (i.e., Berial, Matanbukus, Balkira, Malkira), and insisted that no Christian elements whatever could be found here.

II. The Vision of Isaiah (the only section which can be corrected entitled "the Ascension of Isaiah"), of Christian origin.--6:1-11:1, 23-40. Dillmann saw evidence for the original independence of this section in the Latin version published in Venice, in which this section is still separated from the first chapters; moreover, he notes that even in the Ethiopic text a new title begins ch. VI. He dated this section slightly later than the apostolic age and suggested that the writings of the early church--e.g., I Peter 1:10-12; I Cor. 15:47; Eph. 4:10; 1:21; Col. 2:15. With regard to the ideas found here which are usually cited as "gnostic," Dillmann underlines the fact that such "ideas" were frequently found in Jewish circles of the first century, particularly the Essene group, and insists that these ideas pre-date any formalized "gnostic school."

---

[27] Dillmann, Ascensio Isaiae, esp. pp. IX-XIII. Cf. summaries of Dillmann's work in Charles, Ascension, pp. xxxvi-xxxviii, and Tisserant, Ascension d'Isaie, pp. 46-49. Dillmann's position is followed by G. Beer in Kautzsch, APAT 2 (1900): 119-127.

III. These first two parts, each containing a memorable episode concerning Isaiah, were joined together by a Christian writer who also added an introduction, 1:1-2, 4b-13, and an epilogue, 11:42-43.

IV. To the above composition, a later Christian author added the apocalypse of 3:13-5:1, and the narrative of the earthly life of Christ, 11:2-22. Several other verses were added at the same time; 1:3-4; 5:15-16; 11:41. Dillmann's followers found external textual confirmation that these were additions, since the publication of von Gebhardt showed no trace of either passage (i.e., 3:13-5:1 and 11:2-22); 11:2-22 is absent also from von Gieseler's old-Latin Visio Isaiae. Thus, on the basis of textual comparison, Dillmann's conclusions seemed beyond question.[28]

R. H. Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah (1900)

Charles began his discussion of the Ascension by denying, first, the conclusions drawn by Gebhardt which became for the followers of Dillmann textual proof of Dillmann's analysis and, second, the validity of Dillmann's separation of the "Vision of Isaiah" (6:1-11:1, 23-40) and the later Christian additions (3:13-5:1 and 11:2-22).[29] Charles dogmatically declared that Gebhardt was wrong and, contrary to Gebhardt's conclusion, presented textual evidence that indicated both sections were in fact known to the writer of the Greek Legend. Charles's evidence is brief but forceful.

---

[28] This evidence is cited, for example, by Beer, APAT 2: 121, and Schürer, History, p. 144; Oscar von Gebhardt, "Die Ascensio Isaiae als Heiligenlegende. Aus Cod. Gr. 1534 der Nationalbibliothek zu Paris." ZWT 21 (1877-78): 330-353; Gieseler, Vetus translatio latina Visionis Jesaiae. It is on this basis that Beer, following Dillmann's analysis, translated only what Dillmann considered the Jewish document.

[29] Charles, Ascension, pp. xxxviiff.

> Thus in Greek Legend, ii.6, the words τὴν ὅρασιν τὴν ἐπὶ βαβυλῶνα are derived from iv.19. Again in ii.38 ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν θεοί, καὶ πλὴν ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος θεός are more nearly related to iv.6, 8 than to x.13. Again, ii.11 ὁ κρατήσας τοῦ κόσμου comes from iv.2 of our book, and εἰς ἀπωλείας ἐκπεμψει βυθον in the same passage appears to be found on iv.14. But the most striking passage is ii.39 where the corrupt text καταβήσῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον τοῦ ἅδου ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ is drawn literally from xi.19, 20 of the Ascension.[30]

In his Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (1913), Charles gave no details but again asserted his strong disagreement with Gebhardt's position. He maintained that "the writer of the 'Greek Legend' was acquainted with both these sections, inasmuch as he incorporates phrases from iv. 2, 6, 8, 19, xi. 19, 10."[31] Charles's point is well taken, but from a methodological stance his position is not as solid as it appears "textually." His terminology is cautious: "the words . . . are derived from . . . are more nearly related to . . . comes from . . . appears to be founded on . . ."[32] He wrote that the writer of the Legend knew the Ascension "inasmuch as he incorporates phrases from" such-and-such passages. The observation of the "incorporation of phrases" seems questionable as a means of relating texts. Charles, nonetheless, moved beyond Dillmann's analysis of the Ascension and set forth his own which can be summarized in the following way:[33]

---

[30] Ibid., pp. xxxvii-xxxviii. See also, for example, his discussion of the Greek Legend and its relationship to his own "archetype G" (pp. xxxi-xxxiii). Charles is convincing in his analysis of the relationship of various parts of the text. E.g., (1) the unity of the theme, "the concealment of the real nature of Christ," in chs. 10:8-11:19, which includes what Dillmann bracketed; (2) the details of the "vision," 11:2-22, in view of what the reader is led to expect from 10:8-24; (3) again, from 9:12-17 the reader anticipates that the vision will also include crucifixion, descent into Sheol, and resurrection; these details come in the disputed passage, 11:2-22 (cf. pp. xxii-xxiv). These and other considerations demonstrate Charles's genius in textual analysis.

[31] Charles, APOT 2: 157.

First, the work is composite; Charles was convinced that Dillmann was correct on this point. Thus, he wrote:

> This is obvious, and has been all but universally recognized from the fact that ii. 1-iii. 12 has been forcibly sundered from v. 1b-14 by a piece of writing alien to it, iii. 13-iv. 22.[34]

Moreover, the "arbitrariness and disorder" are not confined to this passage. Charles vividly demonstrated this by sketching the chronological order of events as narrated in the Ascension text compared to their original order.[35] For example:

---

[32] Charles, Ascension, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

[33] The summary given here is taken primarily from Charles, Ibid., pp. xxxviii-xliii.

[34] Ibid., p. xxxviii. Methodologically, Charles placed a great deal of emphasis on content and continuity. Dillmann too had recognized that the reasons given for Isaiah's martyrdom (ii. 1-iii.12; v.1b-14) were quite different from those given in iii.13, v.1a, v.15, 16, and xi. 41.

- (a) Testament of Hezekiah, iii. 13b-iv. 18= in the fifteenth year of Hezekiah's reign (i. 4)
- (b) Isaiah's Vision, vi.-xi. 1-40= in the twentieth year of Hezekiah's reign (i. 6, vi. 1)
- (c) Hezekiah commands Manasseh in Isaiah's presence, etc.: Isaiah's prophecy, i. 1-2a, 6b-13=twenty-sixth year of Hezekiah's reign (i. 1)
- (d) Manasseh becomes king and puts Isaiah to death, ii. 1-ii. 12, v. 1b-14=at least four years later than the date last mentioned.

With regard to this strange medley of material which has no semblance of order, Charles observed:

> A Writer could hardly arrange his work in this topsy-turvy manner if he were writing it first-hand.[36]

The present order of the narration becomes more intelligible, according to Charles,

> if he [the writer] was dealing with existing materials which did not admit of disintegration (such as vi.-xi., and in a less degree iii. 3b-

---

[35] Ibid., p. xxxix.

[36] Ibid. Charles's observation is not faultless, since it implies that a "redactor" would do what an author would never do. On this point of redactor-versus-author debate, see the observations by F. C. Porter, AJTh 18 (1914): 106-118.
It seems that even a redactor would have some interest in smoothing out and polishing his work into some semblance on oneness. In a footnote (note 2, p. xxxix), Charles asserted that the writer of the Greek Legend noticed these chronological inconsistencies and sought to avoid them by changing or omitting indications of date.

iv. 18) and easy incorporation into his work.[37]

Like Dillmann, Charles divided the book into three separate, and, very probably, originally independent, pieces.

(a) The Martyrdom of Isaiah=i. 1, 2a, 6b-13a, ii. 1-8, 10-iii. 12, v. 1b-14.

The extent of the Martyrdom section is greater in Charles's analysis than in Dillmann's, since Charles believed that "other fragments survive in chapter i." In his opinion, this assertion was sufficiently proven by certain overlappings and obvious relationships within the makeup of the text itself. For example, ii. 1 calls for some kind of an answer concerning the "commands" which are mentioned; Charles pointed to i. 1, 2a as "a probable answer" (cf. i. 6b, 7; ii. 1).[38]

(b) The Testament of Hezekiah=iii. 13b-vi. 18, and (c) the Vision of Isaiah=vi. xi. 1-40.

Even though these two sections appear to have been independent works, on the basis of the similarity of thought and diction, Charles suggested the possibility that "they were the work of one and the same writer, or the work of two closely related writers." He cited several instances of Hebrew or Aramaic idioms which have survived in the text (e.g., iii. 27: εῖς καὶ εῖς καὶ εῖς ἐν τόποις καὶ τόποις) and averred that "the Christian Testament of Hezekiah" may have been based on an earlier Jewish work.[39]

---

[37] Ibid., p. xxxix.

[38] Ibid., p. xl.

Charles succintly stated his own position on the Ascension in the following conclusion to his introduction to the structure of the text:

> To sum up: *the conditions of the problem are sufficiently satisfied by supposing a single editor, who had three works at his disposal, the Martyrdom of Isaiah of Jewish origin, and the two independent works, the Testament of Hezekiah, and the Vision of Isaiah, of Christian origin. These he reduced or enlarged as it suited his purpose, and put them together as they stand in our text*.[40]

Certain methodological procedures are clearly detected in Charles's analysis. In the first place, he rejected Dillmann's analysis of the text on the basis of a comparison of the Ascension text with the *Greek Legend*. Dillmann labeled the "Vision of Isaiah," 6:1-11:1, 23-40, as stage two in the development of the present text, and separated it from what he considered to be later Christian additions, 3:13-5:1 and 11:2-22. Charles contended that both of these sections appeared in the *Greek Legend* and thus could not be separated chronologically as different stages

---

[39] Ibid., p. xliii. Charles pointed out the following points of similarity: (1) the "seven heavens," iii. 18, iv. 14, 16, and passim, vi-xi; (2) "garments" (=spiritual body), iv. 11, vii. 22, viii. 17, 26, etc.; (3) "angel of the Holy Spirit," iii. 16, vii. 23, etc.; (4) the blasphemous claim of the antichrist, iv. 6, 8, x. 12, 13; (5) the judgment of angels and the destruction of the world, iv. 18, x.12.

[40] Ibid., p. xliii. Italics in the original. This conclusion is quoted by Charles, *APOT* 2: 157.

XUM

in the development of the text.[41] In the second place, the continuity of the text is a major factor in Charles's analysis. For example, in the citation given in the discussion of his position above, he declared that ii. 1-iii. 12 "has been forcibly sundered from v. 1b-14 by a piece of writing alien to it." Moreover, he showed that this kind of "arbitrariness and disorder" is evident throughout the narrative; he demonstrated this by reconstructing the chronological order of the events in the narrative.

A third emphasis is underscored when Charles pointed out certain internal evidences of content material; namely, some passages seem either to anticipate further development or to assume certain information on the part of the reader. For example, from overlappings observed in the text, he departed from Dillmann's analysis by interpreting i. 1-2 as part of the original Martyrdom narrative; Dillmann had seen this passage as part of a later "introduction."

An examination of Charles's APOT 2 (1913) also indicates several aspects of his methodology.[42] A quick glance at his bracketed sections will suffice. A portion of 1:7 reads:

---

[41] Interestingly enough, Dillmann's followers used the same document, the Greek Legend, as external evidence for Dillmann's analysis.

[42] Charles, Ascension, 1900, observed that Beer's introduction to the text (APAT 2 (1900): 119-123) was excellent "but unhappily confined to ii.-iii. 12, v. 2-14" (p. xxxvi). Charles's 1913 edition contains only what he considered "Jewish" (which, in fact, was Beer's stated purpose in his translation); thus, Charles included little more than Beer had done at an earlier time.

> . . . Isaiah said to Hezekiah the king, . . . 'As the Lord liveth, whose name has not been sent into this world, and as the Beloved of my Lord liveth, and as the Spirit which speaketh in me liveth, . . .'

Regarding the bracketed phrase, Charles wrote: "This is an addition by the Christian editor who thus converts a reference to the transcendence of God into a doctrinal statement about the Trinity."[43] Thus, on doctrinal grounds he bracketed the phrase as an obvious interpolation. This kind of interpretation rested upon the assumption that at a very early time a distinction could be made between Jewish and Christian doctrine.

Charles also bracketed a longer section, 2:12-16, and in his notes he observed simply: "12-16 is an insertion and interrupts the narrative of ii. 11-iii.1."[44] This again demonstrates the criterion of textual continuity which was cited earlier for its prominence in Charles's analysis of the text in his 1900 edition of the Ascension. This method of working with a text as important as it is in the works of Charles and his followers, was rationalized by Thomson[45] and indicted by Burkitt[46] as the error of reading an ancient book "as it was never intended to be read." One final example again illustrates Charles's dependence upon textual evidence. 3:12 reads: "And the words of Belchira pleased him exceedingly , and he sent and seized Isaiah." Charles noted simply: "E only." Thus, since the reading is found only in the Ethiopic (E), Charles felt justified to label it as a later insertion.[47] No genuine questions of interpretation should depend on the inclusion or omission of this one word. This nonetheless demonstrates the stress placed on textual evidence in Charles's handling of pseudepigraphical texts.

---

[43] Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 159, note.

[44] Ibid., p. 160, note.

[45] Books Which Influenced Our Lord, pp. 340-348.

[46] Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, p. 48.

Challenges to a Position

The conclusion that the Ascension of Isaiah was a composite document made up of Jewish/Christian materials which had been brought together by a process of redaction and interpolation had its challengers, both before and after the work of R. H. Charles. The several views sketched here represent the full spectrum from the very imaginative (non-critical?) to the most sophisticated theories of literary and theological unity.

The "historical context" as an answer

One of the early most imaginative approaches was that of John H. E. Thomson in his work of 1891, Books Which Influenced Our Lord. Under the broad heading "Post-Christian

---

[47] APOT 2:162, note.

XUM

Apocalypses," Thomson dramatically visualized the writer of the Ascension of Isaiah in the context of "the Neronian persecution."

> In the midst of these scenes of horror there wandered one from Judea who belonged to the sect that had their headquarters at Engedi by the Dead Sea. Into the great colluvies of nations by the Tiber had floated one of the Christian Essenes. He--like so many before him--had had visions, and upon him had rested--so had he dreamed--the spirit of Isaiah. He felt all the more akin to the evangelical prophet that he was himself a Christian, and to him all the prophecies of the son of Amoz were full of Jesus of Nazareth. It seemed to him that Isaiah must have seen more than he had related in the prophecies that have come down. And as he dwelt in thought upon this, he too seemed to be swept away up into heaven after heaven, and saw mighty marvels. The spirit of Isaiah had come down upon him, and had carried him away up into the seventh heaven.
>
> This was what he had seen and revealed in the manuscript he had left in the sacred library at Engedi.[48]

This is Thomson's picturesque and imaginative delineation of the narrative. Critical notations are given, but are rare. For example, in the vision he recognized elements in "the Gosepl history" which "speak of the coming of the Gnostics."[49] Further, he agreed with Dillmann that 3:13ff is an interpolation because of its seeming intrusion into the context, and that the introduction was probably added by a later hand.[50] Since no part of the original Greek or Hebrew is extant, Thomson recognized the impossibility of proving decisively whether or not the Ascension is the work of one hand.[51] Nonetheless he maintained that the "sameness of views" in the various parts seems to indicate unity very distinctly.[52] Some scholars had advocated the view that the author of the 'Martyrdom' could not be the author of the 'Ascension' on the basis of the different names given to the devil: Berial in the Martyrdom; Sammaël in the Ascension.[53] Thomson presented no evidence to the contrary, but maintained that this procedure was poor for building an argument for dual authorship.

---

[48] Thomson, Books Which Influenced Our Lord, p. 342.

[49] Ibid., p. 344. [50] Ibid., pp. 346-347.

To Charles the original independence of various sections of the text was suggested both by the awkward arrangement of the text in its present form and by the fact that Origen seems to have known only of the "Martyrdom," while Epiphanius shows no sign of knowing anything but the "Vision." Thomson again assumed a "setting in history" which explained, to his satisfaction, this seemingly awkward structure within the text.[54] The author had come to Rome

---

[51] This perhaps suggests that methodologically Thomson would contend that what looked like separate pieces, breaks in context and continuity, and the like, were in fact the results of the translation and transmission of the text.

[52] Ibid., p. 452.

[53] Ibid., Thomson's example of this view is Langen, Das Judenthum in Palästina, 1866, pp. 157-167.

[54] Ibid., pp. 452-453. Thomson cited Origen and Epiphanius only to refute them.

XUM

and had seen the Neronian persecution[55] and subsequently had made an addition to his original work; an addition which may have been a separate work before it was added to the original composition. On this premise, he drew the following conclusion:

> As most likely he [the author] would have no opportunity of editing his own work, what seems the blunder of putting what is really the end of the 'vision' or 'ascension' at the end of the trial, and before the Martyrdom, is easily explained.[56]

Even though Thomson noted his agreement with Dillmann on several points, he revealed a lack of critical precision in his final remark about the makeup of the text:

> The most marked proof of unity of authorship is the reference back and forward from the one part to the other.[57]

Thomson apparently was referring to what Dillmann, Charles, and others labeled as "editorial comments": "patches" which attempted to give a semblance of unity to this, doubtless, composite work.

The approach used by Thomson in seeking solutions to the problems inherent in the structure of the text of the Ascension offers little methodological help to the modern student of the pseudepigraphical materials. It does illustrate the tendency to rationalize a text in a way that solves problems by avoiding them; an approach which, in spite of the lack of both textual and historical evidence, leads to quite logical solutions once the premise (i.e., the assumed historical setting) is accepted!

---

[55] Thomson left it hypothetical: "If the author of the 'vision' had come to Rome . . ." (p. 453).

[56] Ibid., p. 453. [57] Ibid.

"Theological unity" of the ascension text

In his significant study published in 1914, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, F. C. Burkitt suggested that Christian apocalypses could conveniently be grouped into three main classes.[58] First, there are those purely Jewish apocalyptic writings whose general subject matter concerns the "near-approaching End of all things in this world" accompanied by "a vindication of right and truth and a punishment of wrong and error." Burkitt maintained that this interpretation of eternal providence was most natural for the early Christian converts who were familiar with Jewish thought and literature. It was not, however, "the natural way" for Gentile converts who had no clearly thought out theology of "the End." After several years passed and the End had not yet come, the need for some new theology became pressing. These conditions, Burkitt suggested set the stage for the development of a second kind of apocalyptic, one which dealt not with the Last Judgment, but with "the fate of individual souls and individual courses of conduct."

---

[58] The following summary comes from Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, pp. 44-45.

This second kind of Christian apocalypses, which began with the Apocalypse of Peter, focused on the fate of each soul and attempted to "make the punishment fit the crime." Besides the purely Jewish Apocalypse and, to use Burkitt's label, the "Pagan Apocalypse," there is a third category which, "while Jewish in form is essentially Christian in its outlook," and is best illustrated in the Ascension of Isaiah. This form deserves attention, Burkitt asserted "not so much for its intrinsic value as for the way in which it illustrates the profound difference which really, though to some extent unconciously, separated the Christian view of history from the Jewish." Free of the frustrating questions of literary unity and theological preciseness and without apology, the writer poured his new wine into the old bottles. In so doing, he made the old mistake of trying to do justice to two ideas at once: namely, the Last Judgment and the Incarnation. The work is an Apocalypse, so the writer's emphasis on the End is to be expected; however, his real interest lies elsewhere. Burkitt wrote that

> the vision of Isaiah, when stripped of its apocalyptic machinery, belongs to the sphere of 'the Faith' in its technical theological sense. It is really a piece of 'dogmatics,' an essay in Christology.[59]

The Jewish view focused on the Judgment; everything pointed to the Judgment and to the New Age that follows it. "But," as Burkitt explained,

---

[59] Ibid., p. 47.

> in the Ascension of Isaiah the idea that the End is the chief thing in history is crossed by the new Christian idea that it is the Incarnation of the Messiah, an event now passed, which is the chief thing in history.[60]

This divergence of form and outlook, in Burkitt's assessment, has brought about a text which has led modern scholars into error in their attempts to separate the various, independent sections, to discover the original Jewish writing and the later Christian additions and interpolations. Humorously--but nonetheless critically--Burkitt wrote:

> I sometimes fancy that the spirit of Beliar must be dwelling in some of my friends when they use the wooden saw to dissect the Ascension of Isaiah. Notwithstanding their efforts it continues to the end to speak with a Christian voice, just as Isaiah did.[61]

Burkitt then spelled out his own approach to the Ascension text.

> I shall venture here to treat it as a unity and as a work of a Christian throughout. Of course, I do not mean to deny that some details in the fanciful story of Isaiah's martyrdom may have been ultimately derived from Jewish sources. But that is a very different thing from regarding the narrative portions of the Ascension of Isaiah as a Jewish document which can be detached from the rest of the work and represented as an independent whole. On the contrary, I regard it as an integral part of the Ascension, constructed from the writer's knowledge of the early imperfect Greek translation of the Books of Kings, supplemented

---

[60] Ibid. [61] Ibid.

> here and there by stray fragments of Jewish lore.[62]

Burkitt admitted that there are inconsistencies in the text,[63] but he insisted throughout that they are due to the "divided aim of the author" (i.e., his attempt to combine the traditional idea of the End and the fact of the Incarnation which he, a Christian, sees to be central) rather than a blending of originally independent documents. This type of handling of a text, which may well be labeled a priori, creates a circular path that takes the reader nowhere. The presupposition determines the conclusion. In fact, they appear to be the same: i.e., the presupposition (the Ascension of Isaiah is a literary unity) = the conclusion (the Ascension of Isaiah is a literary unity)!

Burkitt's argument is admittedly more sophisticated than that set forth by Thomson (see the discussion above, pp. 167-171). A closer look, however, reveals little difference in the two arguments. Both seem to begin with the assumption that the Ascension is a single literary composition rather than an original Jewish document which was later reworked with Christian materials. This prior assumption seems to head off even the consideration of the possibility of redaction or interpolation. Inconsistencies, breaks in continuity, awkwardness in the arrangement of the episodes within the text, and other characteristics, generally used by other scholars to demonstrate the obvious patchwork of the Christian redactor, offer no serious threat. Both Thomson and Burkitt acknowledged the use of existing Jewish traditions about Isaiah's death, but maintained that this in itself means very little.[64] The awkwardness of the text (i.e., the intermeshing of the "vision" and the "martyrdom.") has been central in the position held by Charles, Dillmann, and others who hold to an interpolation theory. Thomson set this problem aside quite simply by assuming two different situations giving rise to the two sections of the document; these sections were later combined, and, since the author has no chance to "edit" his work, the seeming awkwardness within the text appears. Burkitt saw the answer in the writer's "divided aim"--his attempt to deal with the centrality of the Incarnation in a traditional apocalyptic setting which sees the Last Judgment as central!

---

[62] Ibid., pp. 45-46.

[63] Even these, he said, are detected by "learned persons . . . who read the book as it was never intended to be read." Ibid., p. 48.

"Literary unity" of the Ascension

Five years after Burkitt's defense of the unity of the Ascension of Isaiah on the grounds of the blended theological motifs of the author, Vacher Burch set forth another serious challenge to Charles's interpolation idea. In an article entitled "The Literary Unity of the Ascensio Isaiae,"[65] Burch contended for unity because "both so-called Martyrium and Visio were inspired by the same early literary source for Christology."[66] Burch insisted that Ascensio iv 21-22 is the book's description of "its own source" and cannot be written off as an "editorial addition."[67]

---

[64] Burkitt recognized the possible implications of such an acknowledgment: "But that is a very different thing from regarding the narrative portions of the Ascension of Isaiah as a Jewish document which can be detached from the rest of the work and represented as an independent whole." Ibid., p. 45.

The passage which Burch sees as crucial, 4:21-22, reads, in part:

> 21. And the descent of the Beloved into Sheol, it is written in the section, where the Lord says: "Behold, my son will understand."

Then follows a long list of writers who are said to have also attested to the "descent of the Beloved." The "notable-particularity about this passage," Burch contended, is the suggestion that the subject of the Descent "is written in a certain section of a writing"; this writing, according to Burch, is the Testimonia adversus Iudaeos.[68]

---

[65] "The Literary Unity of the Ascensio Isaiae," JThS 20 (1919): 17-23. In a second article, JThS 21 (1920): 249-265, Burch summarized the results of the first, pp. 260-265. Interestingly enough, no one has debated with Burch's efforts, although most recent studies acknowledge his defense for the unity of the Ascension.

[66] Ibid., p. 17.

[67] E.g., Charles, Ascension, p. 37.

[68] Burch, JThS 20 (1919): 18. He gives no further description of this source.

This document is postulated by Burch on the basis of other similar Testimonia which are referred to extensively in his article. For example, citing a text from Isidore Hispalensis in which a testimonium is linked with others from Isaiah liii and xlii, he concluded:

> It is to be seen that the evidence fulfils exactly the demands for a writing which should have a section in it given up to the subject of the Descent together with a specified testimonium for that subject, and that these should be representative of the literary source of the Ascensio.[69]

Burch solved the obvious problem of chronology involved in using a text from Isidore as "a proof" regarding a first century document by citations from various other earlier sources. Citing a Cyprianic Testimonia which also used Isaiah liii and xlii in the same way as Isidore had done, he suggested a common literary source underlying these various texts as well as the Ascension of Isaiah text. Thus he concluded:

> Isidore then is using the same Christological material as the writer of the apocryphon, and it is arranged for each of them in the same way. Moreover, the Cyprianic writing makes it certain that the grouping of the testimonies and the testimonies grouped under the heading mentioned in the Ascensio are not instances of curious agreement between Isidore and its author, but that both writers are drawing upon an inherited document.[70]

---

[69] Ibid., p. 19. The Isidore text cited as i 15. I.

[70] Ibid.; the Cyprianic Testimonia cited, ii. 13. See

Since both the Beloved and Isaiah are linked together in a common source, "the primitive Testimonia adversus Iudaeos," Burch felt there was in every way "support for the assertion that the Ascensio is a single and simple writing."[71]

Burch was correct when he observed Charles's struggle to deal with the phrase: "the descent of the Beloved into Sheol." Charles linked it to Isaiah lii. 13-liii, but confessed the difficulty in finding "any reference to his Descent in Hades."[72]

Since the passage can be bracketed without damage to textual continuity, Charles labeled this entire section, iv. 19-v.1a, as an "editorial addition." Charles was consistent at this point and labeled every reference to "the vision" in the originally Jewish narrative as editorial, that is, a type of patchwork which blends the Jewish tradition of Isaiah's death into the vision (cf. 4:19-5:1a; 5:15, 16; 11:41-43). In this way, he believed a Christian writer was able to take the Jewish narrative and rework it into its present "Christian" form with the simplest of explanations: "On account of these visions and prophecies Sammael Satan sawed in sunder Isaiah the son of Amos, the prophet, by the hand of Manasseh" (Asc. of Isa., 11:41). Burch, however,

---

also, note 3, p. 19, for further citations which Burch felt justified his conclusions.

[71] Ibid., p. 23.

[72] Charles, Ascension, p. 38, note.

responded to only one section of Charles's "editorial addition," verse 21. To be consistent, if Burch takes this section out of the realm of editorial comment and makes it an integral part of the "Preface" (Burch's term for the Martyrdom narrative), he would need to offer some explanation for each of Charles's "editorial additions".

In a second article, "Material for the Interpretation of the Ascensio Isaiae,"[73] Burch further developed the influence of the Testimonia adversus Iudaeos on features of the Ascension text. One aspect of his argument calls for attention, since it may reveal a serious weakness in his methodology. Burch contended--and again rallied numerous citations from the church fathers as evidence--that the document from which the writer of the Ascension drew his inspiration "was first a Christological document." "In a word," Burch wrote:

> the sawing asunder of Isaiah was thought therein to be a prefiguration of the crucifixion. The wood from which the saw was made came from the Cross.[74]

Burch felt that the abundance of textual evidence from numerous early texts demonstrated "wide support in Testimonia texts for this 'wood' theme."[75] This play on the idea of

---

[73] "Material for the Interpretation of the Ascensio Isaiae," JThS 21 (1920): 249-265.

[74] Ibid., p. 261.

[75] Ibid., p. 263. Cf. the solution offered by

"wood" is, in Burch's opinion, the Christological element in the narrative of Isaiah's death and became "the anti-Judaic defence of the 'crucifix'."[76] Burch then unwittingly revealed a serious flaw in his conclusions about the development of this particular "wood" motif.

> Certain scholars [he cites here Charles and Tisserant] are agreed that the tradition which has passed into Talmudic literature is to be dated before the Christian era. That tradition tells how the prophet hid in a cedar tree from Manasseh, but being betrayed by the end of his cloak, the king ordered the tree to be sawn through. It would appear to be a natural base for a Christian writer to work on whose mind was at home in Testimonia thought and exegesis.[77]

Burch has erected a very weak structure: (1) on the basis of an earlier Jewish tradition (2) a Christian develops a Testimonium (3) which subsequently becomes the source for both the Ascension text (4) and numerous other Christian writings. The existence of the document in pre-Christian times as Jewish tradition is a key factor in the position developed by Charles, Tisserant, and others. This fact alone would not provide the grounds for the entire idea of a composite text. This fact, however, together with several other considerations (i.e., the arbitrariness and disorder of the text pointed out by Charles) provides a more cautious

---

D. Flusser, "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect," IEJ 3 (1953): 30-47, for the "wood saw," i.e., a saw to saw wood.

[76] Ibid. [77] Ibid., pp. 263-264.

approach to the Ascension text. Burch has expended his energies solely on the Testimonia arguments; the other questions about the structure of the text have been ignored.[78]

---

[78] Cf. Burch's comments on v. 13 in the context of his Testimonia argument with the interpretation offered by D. Flusser, "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect." Flusser saw the passage in terms of the "dying Isaiah" (i.e., the Teacher of Righteousness) commanding his followers to "go the land of Tyre and Sidon" (i.e., the land of the north, Damascus). This was an attempt on the part of the sect, Flusser believed, to justify their "departure" into the wilderness.

CHAPTER II

THE 'SIMILITUDES' OF I ENOCH (CHS. 37-71)

The Book of Enoch is one of several pseudepigraphic writings ascribed to Enoch.[1] Best known as Ethiopic Enoch, because of the language in which it has come to us, it is also called I Enoch to distinguish it from II Enoch (=Slavonic Enoch)[2] and III Enoch (=the Hebrew Book of Enoch).[3] The Enoch tradition is more complex than is revealed in a mere

---

[1] Little is known of the Enoch whose words and visions are recorded here. The Genesis tradition that he "walked with God" (Gen. 5:18-24) gave rise to the belief that Enoch was translated to heaven where secrets of heavenly regions and the course of human events predetermined in heaven were revealed to him. See, Reid, *CE* 1 (1907): 602; *IDB*, 2 (1962): 103; George Foot Moore, *Judaism*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), 1:127-128. R. Travers Herford, *Talmud and Apocrypha* (London: The Soncino Press, 1933), pp. 211ff., believed I Enoch to be the best representative of apocalyptic literature, and, with the exception of Daniel, probably the oldest now extant. In his *Old Testament Apocalptic: Its Origin and Growth* (London: The Epworth Press, 1952), p. 229, Stanley Frost wrote that Enoch who "in the Old Testament is only a name and not a person" became "perhaps the perfect *tabula rasa* for the apocalyptic imagination to fill with its own strange symbols."

[2] II Enoch is discussed in another section of this dissertation, pp.

[3] III Enoch is a later 1st or early 2nd century C.E. Jewish work in Hebrew. See H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or The Hebrew Book of Enoch*. Edited & Translated for the First Time with Introduction, Commentary & Critical Notes (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1928; re-issued, New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1973.)

designation of documents as I, II, and III.[4] I Enoch itself is a massive conglomerate of materials. With its 108 chapters it is the largest of the pseudepigrapha, in fact, the largest of all ancient Jewish post-biblical writings.[5] It is clearly made up of many originally independent segments which have been edited into its present composite form.[6] Expressing what became the consensus regarding I Enoch, R. H. Charles wrote that this document

> comes from many writers and almost as many periods. It touches upon every subject that could have arisen in the ancient schools of the prophets . . . it is

---

[4] Moore, Judaism 1:127-128, citing Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash, 1853-1877, esp. Part V, pp. 170-190, noted the strength of the Enoch traditions and stated that, even after the complete disappearance of "the eschatological apocalypse" in Judaism, Enoch reemerges in Jewish literature in the role of other "favored rabbis" who were personally conducted to Paradise and Gehenna for special revelations of the secrets of the universe. See also Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Trans. by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. Second Division, Vol 3 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896): 54ff.

[5] UJE, p. 131.

[6] Every composite document has problems inherent within its makeup. With I Enoch difficulties come from the fact that we are working with a translation. Frank Zimmermann, "The Bilingual Character of I Enoch," JBL 61 (1942): 193-204, insisted that I Enoch is a translation of a translation." Moreover, each section of the writing, and even each translation, has its own history. See the discussion by Martin Rist, IDB 2 (1962): 103-105. See also, C. C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945), p. 110; C. C. Torrey, "Notes on the Greek Text of Enoch," JAOS 62 (1942): 52-60; Zuntz, "Enoch on the Last Judgment," JBL 61 (1942): 161-162.

> clear that no unity of time, authorship, or teaching is to be looked for.[7]

Many of the questions remain open-ended and unsettled; one of these is the question of Christian interpolations in I Enoch.

This essay focuses specifically on chs. 37-71, generally known as the 'Similitudes' or 'Parables' of Enoch. It is in this section of Enoch that most scholars debate the question of Christian interpolations which revolves particularly around the "Son of Man" references (46:2, 4; 62:5, 7, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:26, 27, 29; 70:1; 71:14, 17). For the most part, scholars view these references in a general way -- namely, I Enoch is a Jewish document which illustrates the apocalyptic and messianic thought-world of Judaism just prior to and during the first Christian century.[8] Other more specific and dogmatic positions have been set forth, however, which have taken two general directions: (a) the Son of Man passages suggest that the Similitudes section of Enoch is either an original Christian document,[9] or, (b) the

---

[7] R. H. Charles, APOT 2:163.

[8] E.g., Beet, Exp, 4th series, 9 (1894): 439; Dix, "The Enochic Pentateuch," JThS 27 (1925-26): 29-42; Fuchs, UJE 4 (1941): 132; JE 5 (1903): 181; EJR (1966), p. 129.

[9] E.g., Philippi, Das Buch Henoch (Stuttgart: Verlag von S. G. Liesching, 1868) and others whose views are discussed later in this essay. Those who expounded this position are dealt with briefly as an illustration of a methodological weakness in working with a text--namely, a tendency to allow a dogmatic presupposition to control both the direction and conclusions of one's exposition. The

Similitudes is a Jewish writing which has been reworked by Christian editors.[10]

Thus, our discussion has been arranged to include each of these possibilities. No attempt is made to sketch the history of critical inquiry on the text of I Enoch.[11] The positions briefly reviewed in this essay are representative of the directions and emphases inherent in that history and illustrate the diverse approaches taken in the interpretation of I Enoch. From this diversity specific questions have emerged which have subsequently guided our inquiry. (1) What are the methodological criteria which determine an author's approach to the Enoch text? (2) How do these apply, if at all, to the question of possible Christian interpolations in the Similitudes? (3) How have others reacted to these procedures and subsequent conclusions? Have they viewed the text differently? If so, has this led to different conclusions? (4) Have scholars,

---

same tendency is seen in John E. H. Thomson's views on the Ascension of Isaiah, Books Which Influenced Our Lord, pp. 340-348; 451-455.

[10] The views of several proponents of this position are discussed later in this essay.

[11] For a brief survey, see Charles, The Book of Enoch (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1893), pp. 6-21; François Martin, Le Livre d'Hénoch (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, Éditeurs, 1906), pp. LXII-CVI; Erik Sjöberg, Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), pp. 1-39. Also helpful are: Schürer, History of the Jewish People, 1896, 3:59-61, and Schodde, The Book of Enoch (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1882), pp. 19-32.

on the basis of the same general methodology, reached diverse conclusions? If so, does this fact reveal something about the text? The methodology? The scholar?

The 'Similitudes' As A Jewish Document

The genius of R. H. Charles was his ability to sum up decisively the results of scholarship prior to his own, and, at the same time, with his own contributions to set the stage for what is to follow. This is true also of his work on I Enoch. His conclusion that I Enoch was a composite document made up of several pre-Christian, Jewish writings, which give indication of independent origin and circulation before being adopted into one book in its final form, is still the most definitive statement of the "pre-Christian Jewish" position for the English speaking world. His position is discussed first since it provides the most reasonable focal point for our discussion. Second, with respect for both brevity and the purpose of this study as a bibliographical survey, those scholars who agree substantially with Charles are indicated without undue elaboration. Third, to complete the discussion the Similitudes are presented as a Jewish writing, but a far remove from the Charles view--namely, a Jewish anti-Christian polemic on the 'Son of Man' idea.

R. H. Charles on 'I Enoch'

Preliminary observations.--The results of Charles's critical work on the text of I Enoch are well known. In brief: (1) Charles had postulated a Hebrew original whose "whole tone and exegesis" clearly indicated its geographical setting to be that of Palestine.[12] On the basis of

---

[12] Charles summarized his evidence for a Hebrew original, Enoch, 1893, pp. 21-22. In his APOT, 1913, 2: 171-177, he questioned his earlier conclusions and presented evidence to show that chs. 6-36 were originally in Aramaic, and 37-104, and probably 1-5, in Hebrew. Cf. F. C. Burkitt, "On the Greek Text of Enoch," Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, pp. 53-71, who differed with Charles at several points regarding the prologue to Enoch (chs. 1-5). Burkitt saw much in the Greek as "genuine" while much in the Ethiopic is labeled as "interpolation." Torrey, "Notes on the Greek Texts of Enoch," tried to show that Aramaic was the original for every section of I Enoch. H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, Second Edition (London: Lutterworth Press, 1947), pp. 77-84, pointed out Charles's inconsistencies in his discussion of the original language: he wrote that Charles used the same evidence to prove Aramaic for some sections of I Enoch which he used to prove the same for Daniel, but for just the reverse reason. For example, Charles assumed an Aramaic original for chs. 6-36 of I Enoch, which he presented as additional support for a pre-Maccabean date for this section. He wrote that "when once a nation recovers, or is trying to recover, its independence, we know from history that it seeks to revive its national language" (APOT 2:170). In a Maccabean writing, the assumption is, Aramaic would not be used. Yet, for Daniel, Charles argued for an original Aramaic, some portions of which were later translated into Hebrew. To support his argument, he maintained that in order "to get in touch with his countrymen and to bring home to them the ideals for which they stood, the author of Daniel could not do otherwise than write in Aramaic. Only through the medium of the vernacular was this possible, and the vernacular of his day was Aramaic." (Cited by Rowley from Charles, Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, 1929, p. xlv. The italics are original.) Notice also, Schmidt, "The Apocalypse of Noah and the Parables of Enoch," Oriental Studies Dedicated to Paul Haupt. Edited by C. Adler and A. Ember (Baltimore:

historical allusions within the Enoch text and some evidence that Enoch materials were used in earlier writings, he dated the various segments to be pre-Christian.[13] (3) He viewed the composite document as representative of an apocalyptic, "Semitic philosophy of religion" which attempted to vindicate the righteousness of God in his dealings with men.[14]

The Johns Hopkins Press, 1926), pp. 115-116, who also pointed out inconsistencies in Charles's treatment of the original language of the Noachic interpolations.

[13] E.g., Charles wrote that chs. 6-16 and 23-36 were known to the author of Jubilees, and thus must have been written before 161 B. C. (*APOT* 2: 170). Again, with regard to these same chapters, Charles points out that no reference is made to the persecution of Antiochus, thus fixing the *terminus ad quem* at 170 B. C. (*APOT* 2: 170; *Enoch*, 1893, pp. 24-33). Numerous illustrations of this procedure can be noted. Chs. 83-90 are interpreted in terms of the rise of the Chasids and the Maccabean revolt, since Charles concludes that "as this great horn is still warring at the close of the rule of the shepherds, xc. 16, this section must have been written before the death of Judas, 161 B. C." (*APOT* 2: 170-171). Referring to the "Apocalypse of Weeks" (93:1-10 and 91:12-17, most scholars recognize the need for chapter rearrangement), he notes the difficulty in dating precisely but suggests a date prior to the Maccabean revolt, since "there is no reference to the persecution of Antiochus" (*APOT* 2: 171).

[14] *Enoch* (1893), pp. 22-23. Cf. Charles's discussion, "Prophecy and Apocalyptic," in *Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914), pp. 12-46. See also, R. Travers Herford, *Talmud and Apocrypha*, pp. 211-221, who saw I Enoch as the best representative of Apocalyptic, which, he described as "the second main divergence from the common stock of the Jewish religion" (p. 211). The first was "the Ezra-Pharisaic-Rabbinical" interpretation of the Torah along the lines of halachah and haggadah. Apocalyptic, according to Herford, has two main roots: "the sense of mystery" and "the prophetic literature" (pp. 212ff.). The prophets had said many things "hard to understand"; this "mystery of the prophets presented a challenge." Herford writes that "Apocalyptic is the reaction

XUM

The question of the composite nature of I Enoch had involved a methodological struggle for Charles. He described his 1893 edition of Enoch as a detailed polemic against the accepted criticism of the day which regarded chs. 1-36 and 72-104 as the "groundwork" coming from the same author. He argued that "the so-called Grundschrift" had come from at least four different authors and maintained that until this "plurality of authorship" was recognized no adequate interpretation of Enoch was possible.[15] In his major work of 1913, Charles wrote that this "impossible hypothesis" had been abandoned, and he was now able to turn his attention to other questions--viz., "the extent, character, and date of the various independent writings" embodied in I Enoch.[16]

The most noticeable criteria used by Charles in support of the composite nature and general structure of the

---

to that challenge, the attempt to solve that mystery, on the lines and within the range of Jewish thought and speculation" (p. 213).

[15] Charles, Enoch, p. viii.

[16] APOT 2:168. For the older view, see Schürer, History of the Jewish People, 1896, 3:54-73. Charles was not the first to see Enoch as a "composite work." The view was first presented by Ewald, Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henokh Entstehung, Sinn, und Zusammensetzung (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1854). See Charles, Enoch,1893, pp. 10-11, for a summary of Ewald's analysis of the text. Ewald took chs. 37-71 to be the earliest, ca. 144 B.C. This was later abandoned in critical study, and chs. 37-71 came to be considered the latest, to be dated somewhere between 94 and 64 B.C. See Chaim Kaplan, "Constituent Parts of the Book of Enoch," RExp 27 (1930): 211-217, who suggested the possibility that the author of the Similitudes was the final editor of the entire book of I Enoch.

Enoch text are poetry and theological content. First, he stressed the variations within the different segments regarding resurrection, the messianic kingdom, and the nature of "this risen life, its duration and character."[17] Further, Charles noted the advancement of thought of one section over another. For example, he wrote that the author of chs. 83-90 "has advanced considerably beyond the naive and sensuous views of the kingdom presented in i-xxxvi. His conceptions are more spiritual."[18] He concluded the same when he moved from chs. 83-90 to chs. 91-104; here he wrote: "we feel we are entering into a world of new conceptions."[19] Finally, he stressed the importance of his discovery that much of the text of I Enoch "was originally written in verse" and the usefulness of this fact in dealing with difficult passages and, in numerous cases, his success in "the recovery of the original."[20]

---

[17] _Enoch_ (1893), p. 23.

[18] Ibid., p. 27. [19] Ibid., pp. 28-29.

[20] _APOT_ 2: 164. Charles used a critical method not unknown to interpreters of the Psalms with its characteristics of 'Hebrew parallelism.' A somewhat similar technique has been employed in work on some of the Qumran materials. Cf. Theodore Swanson, "I and II Samuel and the Dead Sea Scrolls" (an unpublished paper presented to the Seminar on Biblical Criticism, Professor Walter Harrelson, Vanderbilt University, September 27, 1967). Swanson draws heavily on the works of F. M. Cross, Jr. in demonstrating how gaps were filled on the basis of length of lines in the text when the Masoretic text, LXX, and the Qumran texts were compared. Especially helpful in describing this technique are the following works by Cross: "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of

The interpolations in I Enoch.--Another criterion observed in the work of Charles was his stress on the continuity, or lack of it, in the text. The following summary will indicate the importance of this feature.

Section I: chs. 1-36. The interpolations: 6:3-8; 8:1-3; 9:7; 10:1-3; chs. 17-19. Charles said that "no attempt is made to assimilate them to their new contexts. Generally they stand in glaring contradiction with them."[21]

Section II: chs. 36-71. Charles labeled the following as interpolations which, with the possible exceptions of ch. 50, 56:5-57:3a, are drawn from "an already existing Apocalypse of Noah": 39:1, 2a; 41:3-8; ch. 43; ch. 44; ch. 50; 54:7-55:2; 56:5-57:3a; ch. 59; ch. 60; chs. 65-69: 25; ch. 71.[22] Charles noted that these were "adapted by their editor to their adjoining contexts in Enoch," although exceptions to this are found.[23] For example, on 41:3-8 he wrote: "This section is alien to the context. It may, however, belong to the Parables." Similarly on chs. 43-44

Discoveries in the Judean Desert," HThR 47 (1964): 281-299; "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," IEJ 16 (1966): 81-95. Cf. Martin Rist, IDB 2 (1962): 104, who noted the usefulness of this interpretive device in dealing with the corrupt text of Enoch and concludes: "Despite the condition of the text, in most instances the original thought seems to have been preserved."

[21] Enoch pp. 55-56.

[22] Ibid., p. 106; cf. Religious Development, pp. 222-223.

[23] Enoch 106.

he noted that passages like this (i.e., those dealing with "natural phenomena") "frequently disturb the context in this work."[24]

Section II: chs. 72-82. Chapters 80-81 are interpolations according to Charles. He maintained that "The Book of the Heavenly Luminaries" (in his 1893 edition, this section is called "The Book of Celestial Physics") originally consisted of chs. 72-79 and 82 (which is out of place in its present arrangement), and dealt specifically with the fixed laws regarding the heavenly bodies. Nothing at all of an ethical interest appears here.[25] But in ch. 80, "we enter into a world of new conceptions; the whole interest is ethical and nothing else. There is no fixity at all in natural phenomena: their laws and uniformities are always dependent on the Moral action of men."[26] Charles suggested that the addition may have been made, perhaps by the final editor, "to give an ethical turn to a purely scientific treatise, and to furnish it with some fitness for its present collocation."[27]

Regarding ch. 82 (obviously misplaced since 79:6 is the logical conclusion to the section; cf. 72:1 and 79:6), Charles pointed out a similar "rearrangement" of chs. 91-93 and remarked that the final editor "was fond of such dislocations."[28] This statement adds little to our understanding of the problems involved in the Enoch text. It appears that an editor would aim at smoothing out rough places and blending disruptive materials, and rather unlikely that he would haphazardly rearrange or deliberately dislocate.

---

[24] APOT 2: 212, annotation on 41:3-8; p. 213, annotation on chs. 43-44.

[25] Cf. Enoch, pp. 187-189; also, APOT 2: 169, 244.

[26] APOT 2: 244, note on ch. 80.

[27] Enoch, p. 188.

Section IV: chs. 83-90. Charles described this section as "the most complete and self-consistent," since it "has suffered least from the hand of the interpolator."[29] In his 1893 edition, only one interpolation is noted--90:15. In 1913, 90:15 is not bracketed, but 90:14b is noted as "an intrusion."

Section V: chs. 91-104. Charles labeled only three passages as interpolations (91:11; 93:11-14; 96:2), but again observed that the text has suffered "severe dislocations" at the hands of the final editors.[30]

Of the remaining chapters, Charles said ch. 105 does not belong with 91-104, he labeled 106-107 as a fragment of the Book of Noah, and he treated 108 as "an independent addition" intended obviously as a conclusion to the whole book.

---

[28] Ibid., p. 189. [29] Ibid., p. 220.

[30] Ibid., p. 260. Cf. APOT 2: 260ff., for his rearrangement of these chapters.

General conclusions.--The approach of R. H. Charles to the text of I Enoch demonstrates that the various elements significant for understanding a text cannot be rigidly separated. They blend into each other--e.g., the date depends upon recognizable features of the text such as historical allusions, advancement of thought of one section over another, as well as the dependence of one section on another. Similarly, continuity within the text depends on the understanding of the overall structure and content.

Several dominant impressions are left with us from this overview of Charles's work on I Enoch. (1) All sections of this composite work are pre-Christian. His assessment of I Enoch does not take the form of a polemic. His premise was his belief that there existed in ancient Judaism a well defined concept of the apocalyptic Son of Man.[31] He has dealt with the text from that point of view altogether. For

---

[31] Cf. Torrey, Apocryphal Literature, pp. 110-114; George E. Ladd, "The Kingdom of God in the Jewish Apocryphal Literature: I Enoch," BS 109 (1952): 318-331; 110 (1953): 32-49; Perrin, "Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity," BR 9 (1966): 17-28. Rudolf Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Trans. from the original Hebrew by Herbert Danby (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926), pp. 177-218, did not believe that the concept originated in Israel (pp. 187ff.) but, even before Enoch's time, had become a developed idea in Jewish thought. (See especially pp. 197, 204f., 212-218.) See also, Joseph Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth. Trans. from the Revised German edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf (Boston: Starr King Press, 1957), pp. 256-257, who saw the title as both messianic and pre-Christian, and contended that this messianic significance may even be found in the Talmud and the Targum (see his note 20, p. 256).

Charles, the burden of proof rests with those who would bracket the 'Son of Man' references as later Christian insertions. The only mention of other, more dogmatic, approaches to I Enoch comes in his review of the critical history of the text where the weaknesses of several alternative positions are presented. In his own commentary on the text, evidently he has seen no obligation to answer those who have differed.

(2) The Similitudes, although quite distinct in tone and character, especially with its unique messianic emphasis centering on the 'Son of Man,' is an integral part of I Enoch. Apart from his emphasis on its distinctive content, Charles does not bracket this section in any special way. There is no suggestion of any Christian content (either originally or interpolated) in this section. (3) The 'Son of Man' for Charles has its ultimate source in Daniel. He believed that the title in Enoch was

> undoubtedly derived from Dan. vii., but a whole world of thought lies between the suggestive words in Daniel and the definite rounded conception as it appears in Enoch. In Daniel the phrase seems merely symbolical of Israel, but in Enoch it denotes a supernatural person. In the former, the title is indefinite, "like a Son of Man," as in Rev. i.13, xiv.14; but in Enoch it is perfectly definite and distinctive, "the Son of Man."[32]

---

[32] R. H. Charles, "Messianic Doctrine of the Book of Enoch and Its Influence on the New Testament." ET 4 (1892-93): 303. Cf. Charles's Eschatology, pp. 260-266, where he tried to refute Eerdmans (Theol. Tijdsch., 1894, 153-176), Lietzmann (Der Menschensohn, 1896), and Wellhausen (Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, vi., 1899, p. 199) who all held

The only Son of Man passage which appears to have given difficulty is 71:14 where the text originally read, "Thou art the Son of Man . . ." Departing radically from those who held that this text "elevates Enoch to the dignity of the Messiah," Charles altered it to read: "This is the Son of Man . . ."[33]

(4) Charles attempted at length to show the influence of I Enoch on the New Testament by paralleling passages which, he maintained, "either in phraseology or idea directly

---

that the presence of the demonstrative (only in 62:7 is it used without the demonstrative) rules out the possibility of its being a title for Messiah. They insisted that it simply meant "man." Wellhausen contended that such a phrase as "this Messiah" or "that Messiah" was an impossibility. Charles discussed the Ethiopic translation of the Greek text where in many cases the demonstrative is the translation of the Greek definite article. "Son of Man," Charles concluded, is a Messianic title and represents the Greek ὁ ὕιος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. See, too, his discussion: "'The Son of Man': Its Origin and Meaning," *Enoch*, pp. 312-317.

[33] See his note on 71:14, *APOT* 2: 237. He cited Bousset, *Rel. des Jud.*, 348, and Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 200, who held the view he seeks to refute. Cf. a more recent look at the question by Norman Perrin, "Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion," *BR* 11 (1966): 17-28. Perrin suggests that in the development of the Enoch saga the translation of Enoch had been interpreted in terms of Ezekiel 1 and Daniel 7. Perrin thus relates the Enoch and the Gospel traditions: "Just as Enoch became Son of Man on the basis of an interpretation of his translation, so Jesus became Son of Man on the basis of an interpretation of his resurrection" (p. 26). Perrin, with some modifications, echoes what was expounded earlier by Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, 1943, pp. 201-218. For a brief statement of the several positions on the origin of the 'Son of Man' idea (oriental mythology? development of Hebraic ideas? etc.), see Stanley Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, pp. 217-230.

depend on or are illustrative of passages in Enoch."[34] Other passages are discussed which show the influence of doctrines in Enoch in shaping similar New Testament ideas--namely, the nature of the Messianic kingdom, and of the future life, the Messiah, Sheol and the resurrection, and demonology. If Enoch did not directly influence their formulation, Charles insisted that the ideas in Enoch are "at all events necessary to the comprehension of them."[35]

Consensus and Variation on the position of R. H. Charles

R. H. Charles's conclusion that I Enoch was a Jewish composition free from Christian interpolations is perhaps still the most definitive for the English-speaking world. His position became a summary of the work of many scholars who preceded him as well as a foundation or norm for those who came later. Despite points where some disagreement and variation can be found, the positions set forth by the following scholars agree substantially with his conclusions on I Enoch.

---

[34] Enoch, 1893, p. 41; for the complete list see pp. 41-49. A briefer sampling is given in APOT 2:180-181. Cf. Henry Hayman, "The Book of Enoch in Reference to the New Testament and Early Christian Antiquity," BW, n.s. 12 (1898): 37-46. T. Frances Glasson, The Second Advent. 3rd. edition (London: The Epworth Press, 1963), pp. 30-47, cautions against using lists of parallels (like Charles's) to draw conclusions. He remarks about Charles's list that "on closer scrutiny some of the most striking parallels . . . simply evaporate" (p. 34).

[35] Ibid., pp. 50-53.

Ewald (1854).[36]--It has already been noted that Ewald was one of the first to recognize the plurality of authorship of the several sections of I Enoch. He placed the Similitudes section as the earliest, a position later abandoned in Enoch scholarship. Martin says of Ewald's analysis of the Enoch text: "Cette division ne répond pas à la realité des faits, mais le principe qui l'inspirait est excellent."[37]

Dillmann (1853; 1860; 1883).[38]--In 1853 Dillmann had argued for unity of authorship for the greater part of I Enoch, although he recognized some historical additions and the Noachic interpolations. By 1860 his position had changed only slightly. He saw the Similitudes as an independent work and sided with Ewald on its priority. In 1883 he abandoned his original position altogether, conceded that the Similitudes were later than the rest, and divided the book into what substantially has come to be the accepted analysis in Enoch study.[39]

---

[36] Ewald, *Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henokh Entstehung, Sinn, und Zusammensetzung*.

[37] *Le Livre d'Hénoch*, p. LXVII.

[38] Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch* (Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1853); "Pseudepigraphen des A.T." *RE* 12 (1860): 308-310; *RE*^{2} 12 (1883): 350-352.

[39] See, for example, Charles's summary of Dillmann's analysis as compared to his own, *Enoch*, 1893, pp. 7, 24ff. See also, Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (London: Longmans,

Lipsius (1880).[40]--Lipsius seems to leave the question of Jewish or Christian origin of the Similitudes open. He did not see the evidence for Christian interpolations as decisive and leaned in favor of Jewish origin for the work. That the entire book of Enoch is Christian (as declared, e.g., by von Hofmann, 1852, and Philippi, 1868) he asserted "is quite inadmissible."[41] The interesting conclusion reached by Lipsius is that I Enoch, excluding the Similitudes, "forms a well-connected whole." He contended nonetheless that there was an original document which at different times "was enriched with additions from various sources."[42]

Schodde (1882).[43]--Schodde followed Dillmann's analysis of the text with very few changes. He agreed with Schürer and others on a point that has become a major

---

Green, and Co., 1877), pp. 19-31. Martin, Le Livre d'Hénoch, 1906, p. LXVII, noted that Dillmann viewed 90:38 as an interpolation of Christian origin.

[40] Richard A. Lipsius, "Enoch, Apocrypha Book of," DCB 2 (1880): 124-128.

[41] Ibid., p. 128. The views of von Hofmann and Philippi are discussed later in this essay.

[42] Ibid., p. 125. Cf. a similar idea set forth by Raymond Brown for a gradual build-up of the Fourth Gospel, The Gospel According to John (i-xii). The Anchor Bible, vol. 29 (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966). This rationale side-steps the issue of redaction and interpolation and ignores the evidence of originally independent materials.

[43] Schodde, The Book of Enoch.

argument against the Christian interpolation interpretation of the Similitudes--namely, what is not said. Schodde believed that a Christian would certainly not have passed over the person of the historical Christ without mention of his death and resurrection.[44] He concluded that the Messiah presented in the Similitudes "is perfectly explicable on Jewish grounds, and that, to account for such a view, it is not necessary to assume that it was due to Christian influences. Nothing of a specifically Christian character is to be met with in any part of this section."[45]

Dean (1891).[46]--Dean's main argument rests, as does Schodde's, on the silence concerning the facts of Christ's earthly life.[47] He asserted that everything of Christological import can be gathered from the Old Testament.[48]

Thomson (1891).[49]--Thomson dated the Similitudes about 210 B.C. and placed a great deal of emphasis on Essene influence. Charles saw no possibility of such influence or authorship, and this position, for the most part, has been ignored in apocalyptic scholarship. Kaufmann Kohler was quite critical of Charles in both his I Enoch (1893) and Eschatology (1913) for refusing to recognize the Essene character of the Apocalyptic books. He commended the efforts of Thomson in stressing this aspect of apocalyptic in the fact of such opposition.[50]

---

[44] Ibid., pp. 56-58; cf. pp. 68-69.

[45] Ibid., p. 68. [46] Deane, Pseudepigrapha, pp. 49-95.

[47] Ibid., pp. 89ff. [48] Ibid., pp. 82f.

[49] Thomson, Books Which Influenced Our Lord, pp. 225-248; 389-411.

Schürer (1896).[51]--Schürer's main argument (i.e., the silence on the historical life of Jesus) has been indicated above. Schürer concluded that, after weighing the arguments on both sides, one "must feel constrained to admit that the pre-Christian origin is decidedly more probable than the Christian one."[52]

Burkitt (1914).[53]--Burkitt believed the writer of Enoch to be "an orthodox Jew", but he did not emphasize questions of origin or date.[54] He tried rather to see the meaning of the document in its final form as it spoke a message of hope to a community living in a chaotic world. He saw in the final composition of Enoch a struggle--similar somewhat to the struggles of Job--to see the meaning in life, a purpose underlying history. He compared Enoch with "the eclectic philosopher Posidonius" whose purpose was "to make men feel at home in the Universe." Enoch's world was not an end in itself. Burkitt wrote: "Enoch tells us of the world, to shew us that everything in it is prepared for the inevitable Judgment of the Most High."[55] He declared that the idea of "an unerring Judgment" holds the pieces of this confused book together. He concluded this way: "Enoch has the faults of a pioneer. His work is rough, he is unacquainted with the country, he often loses his way. But his guiding star is a belief that the confused drama of History is not without a purpose, and that in the end the Judge of all the Earth can and will do right."[56]

---

[50] "The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature." JQR, n.s. 11 (1920-21): 145-168. Kohler speaks of Charles's "erroneous construction of Judaism" (i.e., his stress on legalistic Judaism, Halakah) and says Charles should have seen "its [i.e., Halakah] counterpart in the Haggadah which contains the free and popular discussion of the same human, cosmological, and eschatological problems that form the substance of the apocalyptic literature, and form the same wide outlook upon the world" (pp. 151-152).

[51] Schürer, History of the Jewish People, 3:54-73.

[52] Ibid., p. 69.

[53] Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, pp. 17-33; 53-71.

[54] Ibid., p. 20.

Burkitt is to be commended for his efforts to show a sense of overall purpose--even a unity of a sort--in a composite document which, as he himself admitted, at first sight makes "very little sense."[57] Using I Enoch Burkitt addressed the most neglected item in critical scholarship--

---

[55] Ibid., p. 31. He cited E. Bevan, Stoics and Sceptics, Oxford, 1913, p. 98, as his source for Posidonius.

[56] Ibid., p. 33. [57] Ibid., p. 21.

the document in its final form. This is true whether we are dealing with Enoch, the Pentateuch, or the Gospels. In the maze of J, E, D, and P, or the Synoptic Problem, "I-sayings" or miracle stories, and the like, the document in its final form in which it was read and understood and had its impact upon the community of Israel or the early church is sometimes forgotten. Burkitt's conclusions regarding I Enoch must be examined and tested, but his emphasis upon the document as it stands and as it must have had its impact upon the community that preserved and used it stresses an important part of the scholar's work with ancient texts. Questions of date, authorship, and the like, must be asked. The scholar's work is not complete, however, until the question is asked regarding the final form of the text and its meaning in its particular Sitz im Leben.

Box (1932).[58]--Box labeled the Similitudes as an intrusion dividing "portions of the book which belong together, namely chs. 1-36 and chs. 72-105."[59] He saw the Similitudes as the latest section and dated it "not long before the Christian era."[60] Without elaboration he wrote: "Thus it is clear that the book [i.e., the Similitudes] is purely Jewish, since the interpolations are Jewish." His reason seems to hinge on what he labeled, "an addition of a peculiar kind," the identification of the Son of Man with Enoch in ch. 71.[61]

---

[58] G. H. Box, Judaism in the Greek Period (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1932), pp. 219-222.

[59] Ibid., p. 222. [60] Ibid., p. 204.

Herford (1933).[62]--Herford cited the work of Charles as the foundation on which he based his own study of Enoch. His purpose, however, is similar to Burkitt's described above. Herford stressed the main theme of Enoch as "the sovereignty of God, his unapproachable majesty, his almighty power."[63] His assessment of apocalyptic is not as high as that which we have seen in the works of Burkitt, Charles, and others, as his concluding remark shows:

> It [i.e., I Enoch] was a product of its time, embodying some of the worst along with some, very few, of the better elements of Judaism in which it grew up; and the relation of Apocalyptic in general, and Enoch in particular, to the true essential Judaism can only be fitly compared to the relation of the diseased and misshapen branch to the sound trunk of the tree on which it grew.[64]

There are many other studies where the lines of Charles's basic position have been followed and substantiated. The following deserve mention: Beer (1900); Littmann (1903); Martin (1906); Porter (1905); Oesterley (1914); Jansen (1939); Fuchs (1941); Torrey (1945); Sjöberg (1946); Pfeiffer (1949); Manson (1950); Frost (1952); Klausner (1955);

---

[61] Ibid., p. 221.

[62] Travers Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha, pp. 211-221.

[63] Ibid., p. 217. [64] Ibid., p. 221.

Mowinckel (1954); Otto (1957); Bentzen (1957); Plöger (1959); Rist (1962); Rowley (1963); Eissfeldt (1965); Borsch (1967); Denis (1970).[65]

The Similitudes as Jewish anti-Christian polemic

Various suggestions have been set forth as to the meaning of the term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of I Enoch and its relationship to the same idea found in the

---

[65] G. Beer, "Das Buch Henoch," in Kautzsch (ed.), *APAT* 2(1900): 217-310; E. Littmann, *JE* 5(1903): 179-182; Martin, *Le Livre d'Hénoch*; F. C. Porter, *The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers*(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), pp. 299-329; W. O. E. Oesterley, *Books of the Apocrypha*(New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1914), pp. 201-208; H. L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt. Eine Vergleichende Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*(Olso: I Dommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1939); Hugo Fuchs, *UJE* 4(1941): 131-133; C. C. Torrey, *Apocryphal Literature*, pp. 110-114; Erik Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*(Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946); Robert H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times*(New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949), pp. 74-79; T. W. Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels," *BJRL* 32 (1949-50): 171-193; Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*. Trans. from the 3rd Hebrew edition by W. F. Stinespring(New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955), pp. 277-301; S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*. Trans. by G. W. Anderson (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), pp. 346-350, 437-444; Rudolf Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, pp. 176-218; Aage Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 3rd edition. Vol. 2(Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gads, 1957): 242-244; O. Plöger, *RGG*^{3} 3(1959): cols. 222-225; Martin Rist, *IDB* 2(1962): 103-105; Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp. 57-67, 93-99; Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament. An Introduction*. Trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 617-622; F. H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History*(Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 145-156; Abert-Marie Denis, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), pp. 15-30; Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, pp. 164-177, 210-230.

Gospels.[66] Thus far we have surveyed the positions of R. H. Charles and others who view the Similitudes as Jewish and who find nothing in the structure or content of the 'Son of Man' passages to suggest otherwise. Others have contended that the passages are Christian interpolations, while some have claimed the entire section of Similitudes to be of Christian origin. These positions will be discussed shortly. Before leaving our discussion of the Similitudes as "a Jewish document," one further position--in fact, the only alternative which has not been mentioned regarding the 'Son of Man' passages--will be described: namely, the Similitudes are Jewish but post-Christian, written as an anti-Christian polemic.

In 1967, J. C. Hindley[67] questioned the use of I Enoch in assessing the 'Son of Man' idea at the beginning of the first century, and its significance in the Gospels (cf. p. 565). He questioned, first of all, the "common starting-point" in recent Son of Man research (i.e., the existence of a 'Son of Man concept' in first century "Jewish apocalyptic circles") and doubted that the Similitudes was early enough to justify this kind of assumption.[68] He noted that in the quotations from Charles's list of Enoch passages paralleled in the New Testament and the Enoch citations in the early church fathers "almost none are from the Similitudes." This may confirm, he suggested, "the significance of the absence of the Similitudes from Qumran."[69]

---

[66] Our discussion of I Enoch has touched upon the Son of Man research only where it has directly impinged upon the question of interpolations in the Enoch text. The complex problem of the concept in the Gospels (i.e., was it a 'title'? was its origin in Daniel or Enoch? what about non-Hebraic backgrounds? etc.) has been adequately treated elsewhere. See the works by A. J. B. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964); Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History; and H. E. Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.)

[67] "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach." NTS 14 (1967-68): 551-565. This is the only sample of this view found in our bibliographical survey. Hindley's conclusion is quite provocative. Indeed, if a post-Christian date could be established for the Similitudes, the question of the "Son of Man" references obviously would demand re-examination.

Further, Hindley challenged Sjöberg's conclusions that I Enoch 56:7 (1) requires a date before the destruction of the temple and (2) probably presupposes the Parthian invasion of Palestine of 40-38 B.C.[70] He gave a detailed analysis of I Enoch 56, stating that this chapter, through a process of "historical allusion," may "justify a somewhat firmer dating for the Similitudes than most scholars are prepared to allow."[71] He proposed a historical background nearer 113-117 A.D., the time of the major encounter between Rome and Parthia[72] and presented a re-assessment of the Similitudes:

---

[68] Ibid., p. 551. He cited Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, and Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition as examples of this recent emphasis.

[69] Ibid., p. 564.

[70] Cf. Sjöberg, Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch, p. 38, who cited Schürer, The History of the Jewish People, 1896, pp. 67-68. Note: we have cited the pages from the English edition of Schürer listed in the bibliography; Sjöberg cited Geschichte, 1909.

> May it not perhaps be a Jewish work which consciously draws not only on Daniel, but on the Christian use of the term Son of Man for polemical purposes? Over against the Christian record, the writer of Sim. En. suggests another wholly Jewish view of the Son of Man, and perhaps for this reason deliberately identifies him in a mysterious way with Enoch in the words of Sim. En. lxxxi.14: 'Thou art the Son of Man.' He, then, and not Jesus is the true Son of Man.[73]

He maintained that it was much later, when this controversy had died away and neither Jews nor Christians had made use of the title 'Son of Man'

> that parts of the Christian Church began to look upon the Similitudes as a prophecy of the One who in the Gospels referred to himself as Son of Man.[74]

Several reservations are important to note here. First, Hindley makes this one small segment (ch. 56) carry the burden of the entire Similitudes section. The chapter is vague, with specific mention only of "the Parthians and Medes" (v.5) and an allusion to Jerusalem (v.7="the city of My righteous"). An invasion is the only obvious note in the passage, with perhaps a suggestion of Divine intervention

---

[71] Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch," p. 552.

[72] Ibid., pp. 552-564. [73] Ibid., pp. 564-565.

[74] Ibid., p. 565; italics in the original.

(v.8= ". . . Sheol shall open its jaws . . . and devour the sinners in the presence of the elect."). His own reconstruction of the historical setting is detailed and complex. A great deal must be read into the text to see all that Hindley is asking us to see. Second, it should be noted that Charles bracketed this passage (specifically 56:5-57:3) and pointed out its dissimilarity when compared to the Similitudes as a whole (i.e., the Similitudes deals only in general terms and avoids names and clear indications of date, and in the Similitudes "a new heaven and earth will be the seat of the kingdom" rather than Jerusalem, as suggested by Hindley). He suggested that it "would suit lxxxiii-xc or xci-civ, but not xxxvii-lxix."[75] Third, if Jeremias is correct in his stress on the significance of opposition between Judaism and Christianity in the development of Jewish thought from the second century onward, it seems that the idea of Jewish efforts to construct a Son of Man in opposition to Jesus would be quite unlikely. Jeremias makes a strong case for a deliberate attempt on the part of Jewish exegetes in the period after Christ, to remove any traces that Isaiah 53 had ever been interpreted Messianically. He saw this tendency as evidence of a reaction against the Christian interpretation of the passage in a Messianic sense.[76] Finally, Hindley'a argument assumes the existence of a Jewish/Christian controversy over the idea of the Son of Man. He has presented no evidence to demonstrate that such a controversy ever existed.

---

[75] See note on 56:5-57:3, Charles, APOT 2:222.

The Similitudes as a Jewish Document with Christian Interpolations

Emil Schürer argued that the Similitudes contain nothing which was not "perfectly explicable on Jewish grounds." On the one hand, he said it would be incredible that a Jew would likely have borrowed materials which were specifically Christian. On the other hand, a Christian would hardly have been so reserved in his presentation of the 'Son of Man' as to avoid any allusion to the historical Jesus. Schürer's view suggests that the Similitudes must be either wholly Jewish or wholly Christian; the idea of a middle position was out of the question.[77]

The basic materials, those centering on Enoch and Noah, were clearly Jewish. The obstacle was the 'Son of Man' statements. Notwithstanding Jewish scholarship concerning the existence of a 'Son of Man' tradition in Jewish history, some scholars, influenced by the Gospel emphasis on

---

[76] W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias. The Servant of God. Revised edition. Studies in Biblical Theology 20. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1957), p. 76.

[77] History of the Jewish People, 3:66-69.

Jesus as the Son of Man, were not able to see these passages as Jewish. Some other interpretation of the Enoch Similitudes was therefore needed. A middle position developed very early in Enoch scholarship which viewed I Enoch 37-71 as Jewish but with Christian interpolations.

Many scholars have held this view. Several have dealt only incidentally with the question,[78] while others have surveyed Enoch as a part of a larger work drawing conclusions from the critical work of others.[79] The main

---

[78] E.g., Nathaniel Schmidt, "The Original Language of the Parables of Enoch," in Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper, vol. 3. Edited by R. F. Harper, Francis Brown, and George Foot Moore (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908), pp. 327-350; "The Apocalypse of Noah and the Parables of Enoch," in Oriental Studies Dedicated to Paul Haupt, pp. 111-123. Schmidt was concerned largely with proving an Aramaic original for Enoch. In so doing he set forth several interesting ideas which touch on the problem of interpolations indirectly. (1) He doubted that a Greek version ever existed (1926, p. 115). (2) He saw the Similitudes as a composition which developed through "gradual accretion and change through Christian copyists" and tried to understand it from this perspective rather than from the perspective of "documentary analysis" which was in vogue and had been adopted by Beer and Charles (1926, p. 115). He thus drew the conclusion that this Enoch section was "written in Aramaic by a Jewish author in the reign of Caius Caligula (37-41 A.D.), was somewhat expanded in the reign of Domitian (81-96 A.D.) when so many Jewish apocalypses exhibiting an advanced Christology appeared, did not form a part of Enoch collected and translated into Greek, was copied by Aramaic speaking Christians who occasionally retouched the text with reminiscences from the gospels, and finally was rendered into Ethiopic in the sixth century by a Jewish Christian in Abyssinia whose native language was Aramaic." (1926, p. 119)

[79] E.g., Glasson, The Second Advent (London: The Epworth Press, 1945), pp. 56-62; Mangenot, DThC, I, 2 (1930): cols. 1480-82. Matthew Black, too, has shown some hesitation regarding the Similitudes and appears to

XUM

lines of this position are elaborated in the arguments set forth by James Drummond, The Jewish Messiah (1877), Nils Messel, Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch (1922), and M.-J. Lagrange, Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ (1931).[80]

James Drummond, The Jewish Messiah (1877)

Drummond set out to describe the doctrine of the Messiah "as it was held among the Jews in the centuries during which Christianity appeared."[81] He expressed reservations toward the Messianic ideas found in I Enoch since the question of date was so much in debate. The Messianic ideas are presented in a way which, he said, "forcibly suggests the question whether it must not be . . .

---

have moved from agreement that I Enoch is a completely Jewish document to a position which sees Enoch as having been influenced, or even tampered with, by Christians. See his articles: "The Son of Man in the Old Biblical Literature," "The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus," ET 60 (October, 1948): 11-15, 32-36; "Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch," JThS, n.s. 3 (1952): 1-10. Other works which may be helpful are: Badham, "The Title 'Son of Man,'" ThT 45 (1911): 395-448; and, Campbell, "The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man," JThS 48 (1947): 145-155.

[80] Drummond, The Jewish Messiah, pp. 17-73, and passim; Messel, Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch. BZAW 35 (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1922); Lagrange, Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ (Paris: J. Gabalda et Fils, Editeurs, 1931), pp. 109-116, 242-266.

[81] Drummond, The Jewish Messiah, p. v.

of Christian origin."[82] With regard to his stated purpose of dealing with the Jewish messianic ideas, Drummond discussed the Similitudes at length and concluded that "the Messianic passages in the Similitudes are of unknown, but probably Christian origin."[83] The following evidence constitutes Drummond's argument.[84]

General content.--Several pages are given to quotations of passages (e.g., 45:3-46:5; 48:1-7; ch. 49; ch. 51; 53: 6, 7; 55:4; 61:5, 8; 62:5-9, 14) in which, Drummond writes: "there is much . . . which reminds one of Christian ideas and expressions."[85]

Specific messianic ideas.--In addition to general content, ideas, and phraseology, Drummond contended that specific Messianic ideas in the Similitudes are more Christian than Jewish. First, the Messiah's pre-existence is cited as being "far more agreeable to Christian than to

---

[82] Ibid., p. 49. [83] Ibid., p. 73.

[84] On every major point of his position, Drummond cited Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalypik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung* (Amsterdam: Editions RODOPI, 1966; Nackdruck der Ausgabe Jena, 1857), pp. 91-184, who argued for the Christian origin of the Similitudes. Once Jewish origin for the 'Son of Man' passages is denied, the same arguments project themselves. Thus, the predisposition of the scholar decides a priori what the evidence means!

[85] Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 55. The quotations fill pp. 49-55.

XUM

what we know of Jewish thought."[86] He sees further and more convincing evidence in the use of "son of Woman" in 62:5. Of this expression, Drummond wrote:

> It is possible to believe either that the Messiah would come in celestial glory on the clouds of heaven, or that he would be a chosen man born in the usual way; but it was not possible to hold both these views at the same time till Christianity reconciled them by its doctrine of a first coming in humiliation, and a second coming with angelic pomp.[87]

The continuity of the restored text.--Drummond recognized that the one serious objection to his view was the silence of a Christian redactor about "everything connected with Christ's history."[88] The solution according to Drummond, is to recognize the distinction between "a Christian author" and the Christian writer acting "only as an interpolator." As an interpolator, the writer "would be careful not to depart too widely from the character of the book in which he made . . . his insertions."[89] Though the interpolator of the Similitudes has tried to blend his material into the new setting of I Enoch, Drummond maintained that differences of thought and tone are still to be found. After surveying the Similitudes to illustrate this, Drummond declared that "one other test must be applied."

---

[86] Ibid., p. 59.

[87] Ibid., p. 60. Both Charles and Dillmann read "Son of Man." In spite of MS evidence, Charles chooses the inferior reading. Dillmann assumed the reading on the basis of (1) the frequency of 'Son of Man,' (2) the fact that 'Son of woman' is used only here, and (3) the similarity of the function given to this one when compared to the other 'Son of Man' passages. It is well to note that this whole passage refers to Son of Man in vss. 7, 9, and 14, excluding v. 5 where Son of Woman is found. Schodde, The Book of Enoch, pp. 52, 161-162, saw no problem here, but related it to Micah 5:1ff. where the Messiah is said to come forth from Bethlehem. He noted, too, that Christian translators of the Ethiopic Bible frequently introduced NT expressions into the Old. Schodde concluded that "it is easily possible that the word woman was introduced by the Christian translator for man, or by the copyist, as beezit (woman) and beeze (man) are distinguished by only one letter" (p. 162).

[88] Ibid., p. 60.

> Have we a more consistent text if we omit the Messianic passages, or would such omission render the remainder unintelligible?[90]

Drummond applied this test to the text by summarizing the second and third Similitudes with the Messianic and the Noachic passages omitted and concluded that the omission of the passages gives "a sufficiently continuous text."[91]

Indications of date.--Drummond cited Hilgenfeld as his authority for support of a post-Christian date for the messianic passages in the Similitudes. First, 56:5ff., the passage labeled by Schürer as the only passage which furnishes any clue to the date, is interpreted as pointing to a late first century date, perhaps to a time after the "Nero redivivus" myth had developed.[92] Further, 67:4ff. is interpreted as a reference to Mount Vesuvius, after the first eruption in 79 A.D., which "gave daily premonitions of a fiery judgment."[93] Finally, Hilgenfeld had detected what he felt were traces of a "Gnostic dualism" in the ideas about evil spirits, and thus dated the Christian re-working of the text in the time between Saturnius and Marcion. Drummond accepted Hilgenfeld's conclusions.[94]

---

[89] Ibid., p. 61. [90] Ibid., p. 65. [91] Ibid., pp. 65-68.

[92] Ibid., pp. 55ff. It should be remembered that Schürer came to an entirely different conclusion on the date (ca. 40-38 B.C.), History of the Jewish People, 3:67-69. Cf. Hindley's interpretation of this section discussed

The silence of literary history.--Drummond's conclusion was also based, on the literary history of the similitudes. He pointed to the silence of both the Book of Jubilees (which he believed came from a Palestinian Jew between 50 and 60 A.D.) and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (which he labeled "a Christian book" coming after the destruction of Jerusalem) with regard to the

---

earlier in this essay. Again, we see interesting use of the same evidence. For Schürer (and almost all others holding to Jewish origin) this historical allusion pointed to a pre-Christian date; Drummond assigned it to a late first century date from a Christian interpolator; Hindley saw it as a Jewish writing from a post-Christian era. On the development of the Nero myth, see Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 276-280.

[93] Ibid., p. 58. Cf. Torrey's chiding of Hilgenfeld and others who searched uselessly for geographical clues, Our Translated Gospels (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1936), pp. xv-xxviii. Notice, too, that Charles saw nothing special in this passage, APOT 2: 231-232.

[94] Ibid., pp. 58-59.

Messianic passages of I Enoch.[95] The fact that "the Messianic passages are nowhere cited by the very authors who condescend to avail themselves of the questionable support which the book lends to their tenets" suggested to Drummond a late date for their composition.[96] He had written that once a post-Christian date is accepted for the Similitudes "the probability that much is due to a Christian hand certainly becomes very great."[97] Drummond was convinced of a post-Christian date. According to his interpretation of the Similitudes, those things which in any way sound Christian must be Christian.

---

[95] Cf. Charles on the date of Jubilees (*APOT* 2:1 according to Charles, ca. 135-105 B.C.) and the Testaments, between 109 - 106 B.C., in which Charles saw evidence of later Christian additions (*APOT* 2: 282, 289-290, 291). Schürer, *History* 3 (1896): 114-122, also viewed the Testaments as Jewish with Christian interpolations, but assigned a date which would reach into the first Christian century for parts of the work. He assigned Jubilees also to the same era but earlier than the Testaments, whose author, Schürer contended, probably used Jubilees. On Drummond's point regarding the silence of Jubilees on Enoch, Schürer believed that the writer of Jubilees undoubtedly made use of, and may have actually quoted the Book of Enoch (p. 139). Charles said that one should not expect Jubilees to quote or refer to the Messiah passages from Enoch, since in the Book of Jubilees "there is not even the faintest allusion to a Messiah" (*Enoch*, 1893, pp. 14-15).

[96] Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 73.

[97] Ibid., p. 59.

Nils Messel, Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch (1922)

The most detailed exposition of the Christian interpolation theory was set forth by the Norwegian scholar Nils Messel in 1922. Messel confined the genuine 'Son of Man' passages in Enoch to 46:2-4 and 48:2; every use of the name after 48:2 is secondary.[98] Messel believed that "the Son of Man/the Elect One" in the Similitudes is to be identified with Israel, an Elect Community. Two major arguments are advanced to support this particular approach.

First, after the use of the title in 46:1-4 and 48:2, the name disappears, and "the Elect One" is named in the settings which seem to call for the 'Son of Man' designation.[99] Then, Messel noted that in 62:5ff. suddenly the 'Son of Man' designation reappears. The switch seems arbitrary for there are no substantial grounds for it. To this first argument, Messel added that the word "man" signifies simply "man" and is not a suitable Messianic-designation.[100]

Messel did not accept the explanation of Charles and others who saw simply the blending of sources (i.e.,

---

[98] Messel, Der Menschensohn, pp. 3-8.

[99] Ibid., p. 3. He cited 49:2; 51:3, 5; 52:6, 9; 55:4; 61:5, 8, 10; 62:1.

[100] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

'Son of Man' and 'the Elect One'). Messel saw another, simpler way to explain the references to 'Son of Man' in chs. 62ff.--i.e., these passages do not belong to the original text of the Similitudes. He saw two groups of passages: chs. 62-63 and chs. 69:26-71:17. He asserted that the Son of Man passages had been inserted into chs. 62-63 by a foreign, "but certainly Christian hand," and bracketed the entire section, 69:26-71:17, as constituting various Christian supplements to the Similitudes.[101]

The second argument rests on a comparison of Ethiopic terms used for 'Son of Man'. Charles had explained the variations as due to the translator of the Greek phrase, which he felt was no doubt in each case: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. On the basis of an analysis of the translations for "man" -- ἄνθρωπος -- in chs. 1-36, Messel rejected Charles's explanation, and preferred instead to explain the variations as glosses within the Ethiopic text, which have replaced the original phrase--the Elect One.[102]

Chs. 62-63 are concerned entirely with the Elect One and the Kings (cf. 62:1-2). The interpolator (cf. 62:9 and 63:11) seeks to identify the Son of Man as the one around whom the action revolves. Messel contended that 62:6, 9, 14 simply confuse the contents of the text in giving to the Son of Man the functions of God or the Lord of Spirits. Vss. 9 and 14 speak of the "hope" which is set on the Son of Man and of "eating" with him. Messel accepted these ideas as Christian and not Jewish.[103]

---

[101] Ibid., p. 4.

[102] Ibid., pp. 4-9. Cf. Charles's notes on the Greek phrase, APOT 2: 175-176.

Messel pointed out that the switch from the Elect One to the Son of Man in 63:11 is stylistically impossible. The passage begins with the kings of the earth coming before "the Lord of Spirits" to confess their sins (63:1-2). The passage speaks of his glory, righteousness, and judgments. Verse 11 reads:

> And after that their faces shall be filled with darkness
> And shame before that Son of Man,
> And they shall be driven from his presence,
> And the sword shall abide before his face.

Vss. 1-10 is consistent in form; verse 11, where we expect "Lord of Spirits" reads "Son of Man"; verse 12 returns to the Lord of Spirits, who has the last word, rather than the Son of Man. Messel believed that the text may have originally read "before the Elect" or "before him" or perhaps "before the Lord of Spirits." He was convinced that "Son of Man" was not original.[104]

Messel's grounds for seeing 69:26-71:17 as later Christian additions to the I Enoch text are as follows.

---

[103] Ibid., pp. 9-15.

[104] Ibid., pp. 10-11. The citation is Charles's translation, APOT 2:230, who noted its ressemblance to 62:10, where "Lord of Spirits" is read.

First, 69:26-29 has no connection with what precedes.[105] Further, the revelation of the Name of the Son of Man in v. 26 is the single characteristic of the entire passage. He asserted that this appears to be Christian and can hardly be credited to the writer of the Similitudes. According to him, the writer speaks in v. 27 of "the eschatological revelation [manifestation] of the Son of Man," a manifestation (Offenbarung) that is not the expectation of the general contents of the Similitudes.[106] Two passages, 48:6 and 62:7, speak of the manifestation of the Elect, and the impression is given that he is known. Messel contended that "'Name' must here be identical with 'Person.'" This eschatological manifestation of the Name would be perfectly clear to a Christian in terms of the Parousia of Jesus.[107]

Third, ch. 70 pictures the Son of Man together with God--in fact, according to Messel, before God-- as the possessor of the heavenly world. This, in Messel's thinking, is Christian (he cited II Cor. 5:8 and Phil. 1:23 for the hope of being absent from the body and being with Christ); a kind of hope absent from Judaism.[107] Fourth, ch. 71 duplicates what was said earlier (39:3) about Enoch's translation. To Messel, the story is related in such a manner that the entire narrative of chs. 39-63 has been forgotten. Thus, to him ch. 71 does not belong to the Similitudes.[108]

---

[105] Ibid., p. 16. [106] Ibid., p. 17.

[107] Ibid., p. 17; see also, pp. 14-15.

Several observations are possible concerning Messel's interpretation. First, despite his careful work on the text (e.g., relating passages, pointing out arbitrary changes from "Elect One" to "Son of Man," the various Ethiopic translations for the Greek term, and the like) the impression is given that Messel assumed his conclusion from the beginning. For example, Messel rejected the view of Charles that sources are blended and argued that these passages just do not belong. His argument led to his lengthy discussion of the Ethiopic and Greek terms for "man." One is tempted to ask why the interpolator did not substitute Son of Man for every use of the Elect One, since, as Messel contended, he did it here and there. In short, Messel's "simpler" explanation appears more complex and leads to questions which he does not answer.

Further, some of the ideas do sound Christian, as Messel contended. However, in the light of the use of 'Son of Man' and the idea of suffering servant in the Gospel, the use of 'Son of Man' in Daniel and the ideas in Isaiah 53 may also sound "Christian." Caution dictates that one allows the arrows of influence to point in the right direction. If 'Son of Man' had not been used in the Gospels, Messel would have no grounds for argument. It may be asked whether much has been gained by eliminating the 'Son of Man' when 'the Elect One' has the same role and function. Charles himself has perhaps overstressed the influence of I Enoch on the New Testament literature. Neither Messel nor Charles has done justice to the Jewish-world-setting of the early church and the stock of common ideas and materials shared by all. But Charles is correct in his underlying assumption that the burden of proof rests with the interpreter who seeks to eliminate the Son of Man references from the original Similitudes.[109]

---

[108] Ibid., p. 18.

Finally, after Messel's detailed arguments on Greek and Ethiopic terms, his explanation for the switching from "the Elect One" (der Auserwählte) and "the Elect Ones" (die Auserwälten) appears too casual. He saw no problem and said the writer sometimes used "the Elect One" to portray the people (of Israel) themselves. The switch from singular to plural would have come to him naturally, but Messel does not say why. Lagrange, whose view is discussed next, had good reason for his criticism of Messel on this point.

---

[109] Even Charles--in spite of his efforts at objectivity and his insistence on the Jewish origin of the text--could not let 71:14 stand as it was. See his note, APOT 2:237.

M.-J. Lagrange, Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ (1931)

Legrange rejected any suggestion that the Similitudes as a whole is of Christian origin. He said that if Christian authorship were assumed the concern over the fact that no stress is placed on the life of Jesus would be justified. The situation is quite different, he insisted, when an already existing Jewish book is interpolated by a Christian. The interpolator would not change the general makeup of the book.[110]

Lagrange set the problem in terms of a question: is the 'Son of Man' an idea already worked out by the Jews according to the Book of Daniel, or was it Jesus who gave the idea its significance? The first point is held by all who see the Similitudes as a unity; the second could be shown by distinguishing the Elect One from the Son of Man. Lagrange thus tried to show that the Elect passages are originally Jewish and that the Son of Man passages are Christian interpolations.[111]

He was critical of Messel who identified the Elect One and the Son of Man with the people of Israel, "the elect ones." Lagrange insisted that the text is quite clear on the individuality of the Elect One, who is the elect of humanity who has been chosen, not only to reign with others, but also to introduce them into the kingdom. To Lagrange the 'Son of Man' title is the Christian development of the Son of Man figure in Daniel which has been inserted into the original passages concerning the 'Elect One.'[112]

---

[110] Lagrange, Le Judaïsme, pp. 242-243. He cited the example of the "christianizing" of the Testaments of the XII. Drummond made the same point concerning the role of the interpolator, The Jewish Messiah, pp. 60-61.

[111] Ibid., p. 244.

In the two principal passages (41:1-5 and 48:2-5), which are cited in full, Lagrange insisted that the interpolator has held to the character and spirit of the book of Enoch with its themes of judgment and the coming of judgment. The Christian interpolator "with discretion" made necessary insertions in order that Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, would be recognized as the "Elected judge of the living and the dead". In addition to the function of judge two distinctive characteristics mark this "Elected One": (1) his preexistence (48:3), and (2) his destiny to come upon the earth.[113]

Essentially, Lagrange's method consists of indicating New Testament passages which stress characteristics present in the passages cited from I Enoch. For example, for the first major passage (46:1-5) Lagrange cited New Testament passages which express similar ideas: (a) the Son of Man possesses righteousness = Acts 3:14; 22:14; I Pet. 3:16; II Pet. 3:13; (b) he reveals all hidden things = Matt. 13:10,

---

[112] Ibid., pp. 244-246. [113] Ibid., pp. 248-249.

34; (c) he has been chosen by the Lord of Spirits = Luke 9: 35; (d) his lot has pre-eminence before the Lord of Spirits forever = John 16:8-33. The same procedure is used for examining the second major passage, 48:2-5. Lagrange's approach is rather singular--the recognition of similarities in the Similitudes and the New Testament. For every passage he followed this same pattern.[114]

The Similitudes as a Christian Document

Whereas von Hofmann (1852), Weisse (1856), and Philippi (1868) treated the entire book of I Enoch as Christian, Hilgenfeld (1857) attempted to show Christian origin only for the Similitudes.[115] Although these views were generally rejected, a recent revival of interest in the question of the origin of the Similitudes has surfaced in the light of the conspicuous absence of this I Enoch section in the findings at Qumran. Because of this absence, J. T. Milik concluded that the Similitudes were the work of a Judeo-Christian of the second century C.E.[116] Discussing the Son of Man concept in 1958,

---

[114] Ibid., pp. 249-251.

[115] J. Chr. K. von Hofmann, "Ueber die Entstehungszeit des Buch Henoch," ZDMG 6 (1852): 87-91; H. Weisse, Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwartigen Stadium (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Hartel, 1856), pp. 214-224; F. Philippi, Das Buch Henoch; A. Hilgenfeld, Die jüdische Apokalyptik, pp. 91-184.

[116] J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the

C. H. Dodd refused to commit himself on the question of the Son of Man passages in the Similitudes. Referring to the work being done by Milik on the Qumran materials, he expressed hope that perhaps these findings would make possible more definite answers.[117] The Qumran findings on I Enoch are now well known, but dogmatic answers are still not possible. However, the old questions are being looked at with renewed interest. Briefly we shall highlight both the position as it was originally set forth and the more recent emphasis given by Milik and others.

The Question of Christian Origin--A Statement of the Earlier Position[118]

The views of von Hofmann (1852) and Philippi (1868) vary only slightly.[119] Both were attempting to show that I Enoch was written by a Christian to give authority to canonical Jude, whose writer had used only general Jewish

---

Wilderness of Judea. Trans. by J. Sturgnell (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959), pp. 33-34.

[117] The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958), pp. 241-262.

[118] Both Charles, Enoch, 1893, and Martin, Le Livre d'Hénoch, pass over these earlier views without comment. They indicated simply that these views were set forth "for dogmatic reasons" and had been largely ignored by other scholars. Sjöberg, Der Menschensohn, pp. 4-9, has sketched the main arguments on which these earlier positions were based.

[119] Hofmann, "Ueber die Entstehungszeit des Buch Henoch"; Philippi, Das Buch Henoch.

interpretations of Enoch. Both supported this thesis by maintaining--on the basis of the "animal apocalypse," chs. 85-90, and the "apocalypse of weeks," chs. 93+91:12-17--that the date of composition was after the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. In addition to the interpretation of these two passages, von Hofmann used the 'Son of Man' passages as a third argument for Christian origins. He maintained that this name carried Messianic significance which was unknown to the Jews during the time of Jesus. (Cf. Matt. 16:13-16 and John 12:34.) Philippi, too, stressed points of contact with the New Testament (i.e., the use of Son of Man, the similarity of ideas describing his role in Enoch and in the Gospels, etc.) which, he felt, indicated Enoch's Christian origin.[120] He interpreted "the elect righteous" of 93:10 to be Jesus, saw 91:6ff. as a description of the catastrophe of 70 A.D.,[121] and felt that 90:6-42 was a picture of the experience of the early church.[122] In addition, Philippi maintained that I Enoch was used by Christian rather than Jewish writers.[123]

Seeking to interpret Jesus apart from an apocalyptic-eschatological setting, Weisse (1856) stressed more directly the designation 'Son of Man,' which, he believed had no connection with earlier concepts but rather gets its full meaning from its use by Jesus.[124] He met the objection that the idea was already developed in I Enoch by insisting upon the Christian origin of the document. Like von Hofmann and Philippi, Weisse saw no trace of the use of I Enoch in Jewish literature, which to him implied that the book was not accepted by the Jews. Finally, he maintained that the Apocalypse of John made no use of Enoch, which could only be explained by assuming that the Book of Enoch did not exist at the time. He believed rather that I Enoch had been directly influenced by the Apocalypse of John and, from beginning to end, was typically Christian.[125]

---

[120] Philippi, Das Buch Henoch, pp. 66ff.

[121] Ibid., pp. 48f., 53ff.

[122] Ibid., pp. 33ff. Cf. Charles, APOT 2:257-260.

[123] Ibid., pp. 101ff.

Hilgenfeld (1857) differed in his assessment of Enoch largely in his recognition of a Jewish groundwork (chs. 1-16; 20-36; 72-105) to which later additions (chs. 17-29; 37-71; and 104-108) were made by a Christian.[126] Hilgenfeld dated I Enoch as post-70 A.D. He felt this date could be derived from sound textual grounds--the interpretation of the Parthian invasion, I Enoch 56:5ff., in terms of the Nero redivivus legend, I Enoch 67:4ff. as a reference to Vesuvius, and detection of Gnostic dualism. Once this date is accepted, there is no end to the parallels which can be drawn between Enoch phrases and ideas and those found in the New Testament. For example, the description of the Son of Man who has been with God from the beginning who is to be manifested to reign among his people can be understood only to signify the incarnation of Christ and the origin of the church.[127] Again, I Enoch 48:4, "He shall be the light of the Gentiles," can be easily related to the spreading of the Gospel to the heathen world.[128] Hilgenfeld believed the designation "Son of Woman" (I Enoch 62:5) could be understood only after the Incarnation.[129] The reference to the Son of Man eating with men (62:14) could be seen in terms of the words of Jesus in Matt. 26:19.[130]

---

[124] Weisse, Die Evangelienfrage, pp. 212f.

[125] Ibid., p. 218. Cf. Henry Hayman, "The Book of Enoch in Reference to the New Testament and Early Christian Antiquity," BW, n.s. 12 (1898), 37-46, who said the writer of the Apocalypse of John seemed to have been "saturated with the Jewish apocalyptic literature of which Enoch is the prototype" (p. 41).

[126] A. Hilgenfeld, Die jüdische Apokalyptik. Cf. Drummond's position discussed earlier in this essay which rested upon Hilgenfeld's evidence.

---

[127] Ibid., pp. 155-157.

[128] Ibid., p. 157.

[129] Ibid., pp. 157ff.

[130] Ibid., pp. 177f.

The Similitudes and Qumran[131]

Of the ten or more fragmentary MSS of I Enoch among the findings from Cave IV at Qumran, none is from the Similitudes, chs. 36-71; all other sections are represented. According to J. T. Milik this "absence . . . can scarcely be the work of chance." Thus, he chose to see the Similitudes, as the work of a Jewish-Christian of the first or second century A.D. "who re-utilized the various early Enoch writings to gain acceptance for his own work and gave the whole composition its present form."[132]

Milik believed that the redactor, in putting the work together, copied the Journey, the Visions, and the Apocalypse of Weeks "as he found them," but the astronomical treatise--since it evidently did not interest him--was condensed "in a way that leaves it scarcely intelligible."[133] According to Milik, the redactor's whole purpose

> was to set forth his speculations on the Son of Man, and to clothe them with the renowned patriarch's authority.[134]

At first sight, his conclusion appears to be rather logical, but an argument from silence is always a precarious venture.

---

[131] The major portion of what is presented here is from J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea (1959). In a recent study, Milik reiterated his "post-Qumran" date for the Similitudes. "Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumran." HThR 64 (1971): 333-378.

[132] Ibid., p. 33. [133] Ibid., p. 34. [134] Ibid.

Both sides--the logical and the precarious--are illustrated in the following two responses.

Shortly after the Qumran findings were made known and Milik had voiced his opinion on the date of the Similitudes, J. Abertson examined Milik's conclusion in an article entitled, "Application of Mathematical Probability to Manuscript Discoveries."[135] He put the question like this:

> To what extent does the lack of manuscript evidence for a given work during a certain period justify the inference that the work did not exist at that time?[136]

Abertson used the five major traditional divisions of I Enoch:

Part I (chs. 1-36): the Trip to the Beyond
Part II (chs. 37-71): the Parables of the Son of Man
Part III (chs. 72-82): Astronomical Calculations
Part IV (chs. 83-90): Animal Visions of History
Part V (chs. 91-108): the Apocalypse of Weeks

At Qumran the following Enoch MSS were found:

Parts I and IV + chs. 106-107 = 6 MSS
Part III = 4 MSS
Part V (less chs. 106-107) = 1 MS
Part II (the Similitudes) = 0

Total =11 MSS

---

[135] *JBL* 78 (1959): 133-141. [136] Ibid., p. 133.

Abertson discussed the Enoch discoveries from the point of view of mathematical probability. He concluded that to say that the Similitudes section did not exist at the time of the copying of the Qumran materials is a better explanation than to assume that it did exist but simply was either not copied and used along with the other Enoch sections or was lost along the way.[137] Abertson's study provides a 'kind' of logical support for Milik's explanation.

According to J. H. P. Thompson, there are certain factors "to be set on the opposite side" which must be considered in assessing Milik's view.[138] Thompson did not take seriously Milik's suggestion that the Similitudes is a Jewish work of the second century A.D., and stressed the evidence of Jeremias regarding the tendency of Jewish theologians from the second century onward to avoid "characteristically Christian terms."[139] He is mainly concerned about Milik's conclusion which implied Christian authorship. Against Milik's conclusion Thompson reviews the arguments already offered by Sjöberg and others. In order to accept Christian authorship of the Similitudes, one must take seriously the one large--and seemingly insurmountable--challenge: the strange fact that there is "so little that is specifically Christian." Thompson concluded that a first century A.D., perhaps even earlier, date is still preferable for the Similitudes, when the evidence from both sides is considered. He suggested that another reason must be found to explain their complete absence from Qumran.[140]

---

[137] Ibid., p. 140. In Milik's recent study of the question, HThR 64 (1971): 333-378, he referred to the support of probability. See "Figure 1," pp. 336-337, in this latest study.

[138] "The Son of Man: The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls." ET 72 (1960-61): 125.

[139] Ibid., citing Jeremias, The Servant of God. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1957), p. 76.

Other questions could be put to Milik on the peculiarities of the Enoch findings. Could the problem be turned around? Rather than looking at the absence of the Similitudes, perhaps a look at the "community" as it existed at Qumran would provide a clue. Abertson may be correct in asserting the improbability of their absence being accidental. But to assume thereby that they did not exist is answering the question before it is asked.

David Flusser wrote that the Enoch literature (except for the last chapter), Jubilees, the Testaments of the XII, and the Damascus Document "provide no evidence of having originated in a tightly organized religious community such as is reflected in the writings of the Dead Sea sect proper."[141] Werner Foerster concluded that the Similitudes "may . . . stand at a further remove from the Essene movement."[142] Reflecting on their absence from Qumran, A. J. B. Higgins admitted that it "may be purely accidental," but added this precautionary word: "perhaps the type of apocalyptic they present did not appeal to the sect."[143] The most obvious and logical trail may be sometimes misleading. In this revival of interest in the origin of the Similitudes, the other side must be examined. Milik may have been too hasty in drawing his conclusion: viz., the Similitudes are absent at Qumran = this is surely not accidental = they must not have existed at the time = thus, a late first, early second century date. To turn it around would be to say: the Similitudes are absent at Qumran = this is surely not accidental = in the light of the evidence of its earlier Jewish origin, why did the Qumran sect not use them? This line of thinking needs to be investigated.[144]

---

[140] Ibid.

[141] "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect." IEJ 3 (1953): 38.

---

[142] From the Exile to Christ. A Historical Introduction to Palestinian Judaism. Trans. by Gordon E. Harris from the 3rd. German Edition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 76.

[143] Jesus and the Son of Man (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 199.

[144] The idea of absence is significant only if we have the whole Qumran library. How much do we have? What conclusions can be drawn from what has been found? Milik has opened up areas which need further investigation. Our conclusions, however, must be cautious in the light of what we still do not know about Qumran.

Preliminary Observations and a Tentative Conclusion

After surveying the basic positions on the Similitudes several observations are possible. It appears that the position taken on the Similitudes is directly linked to what one is willing to let the document say. For those who accept the 'Son of Man' concept as a part of Jewish thinking its use in the Similitudes has not been viewed as obtrusive. Conversely, to deny that the 'Son of Man' is a part of Judaic thought is to conclude before you have begun and there remains only to justify the conclusion.

This justification generally has been based upon (1) assigning a post-Christian date to the writing, and (2) relating phrases and ideas of Enoch to similar ones in the New Testament. The weakness of the first point is suggested in that the particular passages used to fix the date are interpreted quite differently by those who accept the Similitudes as Jewish. The weakness of the second is what Samuel Sandmel has called "parallelomania." This term Sandmel uses to label

> . . . that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction.[145]

---

[145] "Parallelomania." Two Living Traditions. Essays on Religion and the Bible (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972), p. 291.

This tendency to draw hasty conclusions about source and direction of influence from common and familiar sounding phrases and ideas overlooks the Sitz im Leben of the early Christian community which was, in fact, the world of first century Judaism. At the same time, it assumes that a definite distinction can be made between Jewish and Christian ideas at a very early time. The origin of the 'Son of Man' designation used in the Gospels may still be an open-ended issue, but that the idea is found both in Enoch and the Gospels should be no surprise.

The point of the "life-setting" of the early church can be carried farther. The concern over the Christian redaction and re-working of some of these Jewish materials sometimes has obscured the broader and more basic fact--that, as a body of literature, the apocalyptic tradition was preserved by Christianity rather than Judaism.[146] These texts were preserved by at least a segment of the early Christian church. While some of these Jewish texts were "christianized" by means of interpolations and additions, others were obviously adopted without change. The question could be raised in relation to apocalyptic in general and Enoch specifically: why must we demand a redactor, an interpolator, in every case, in order to see a text as

---

[146] Cf. Philip Vielhauer's introduction to "Apocalypses and Related Subjects" in Edgar Hennecke's NTA 2 (1965): 581-642. Also, Foot Moore, Judaism 1: 125-134.

"Christian"? A new emphasis may be needed concerning this literary "Jewish heritage" of the early Christian community. To separate sharply what is "Christian" and what is "Jewish" in this early period may create artificial and arbitrary distinctions.

At this juncture, this writer chooses to accept the Similitudes as Jewish, without Christian interpolations. The only other alternative would require a strained effort to remove the 'Son of Man' references, and there is neither textual evidence, nor, in the light of Jewish thought, any theological reason for doing so.

CHAPTER III

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

References to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are found as early as Origen, and the document itself came to light and was popularized in Grosseteste's Latin translation in 1242.[1] The first lengthy treatment came when J. E. Grabe offered the first printed edition of the Greek text in 1698 and suggested that the Testaments was an original Jewish work that had been subsequently interpolated by a Christian.[2] This position was rejected by his contemporaries and was not revived until two centuries later, when, in 1884, Friedrick Schnapp again proposed it.[3] His revival of Grabe's interpolation thesis eventually prevailed, due especially to the work of R. H. Charles and his contemporaries, F. C. Conybeare, Emil Schürer, Wilhelm Bousset, Leonard Pass and J. Arendzen.[4] E. J. Bickerman in 1950 wrote that Grabe's interpolation theory had become so well accepted by all critics that it was no longer necessary to argue the matter.[5]

---

[1] Robert Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 865; R. H. Charles, DB(H) 4 (1911): 723; Morton Smith, IDB 4 (1962): 576. No one is sure where Grosseteste got the Greek copy which he translated. Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 283, speculated that he "procured from Greece the MS of this book." Sinker, mentioned the early references in Origen and others and wrote that "after them a blank ensues, till the reappearance of the Testaments in the middle of the 13th century." Sinker cited as his source for this early period: Matthew Paris, Historia Anglorum, A.D. 1242: vol. iv. p. 232, ed. Luard.

[2] J. E. Grabe (ed.), Spicilegium SS. Patrum I (Oxoniae: [n.n.], 1698), 129ff. See especially the summary statements given in Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 866, and Charles, DB(H) 4 (1911): 721. Both Sinker and Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 295, cited a 2nd edition, 1714.

[3] Friedrich Schnapp, Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1884).

There were, however, those who questioned and challenged the prevailing interpolation view of the Testaments. M. de Jonge, in 1953, revived--in a more technical and thorough way--the question of the Christian origin of the document.[6] Yet another position was taken in studies by André Dupont-Sommer, Marc Philonenko and others who saw the

---

[4] F. C. Conybeare, "On the Jewish Authorship of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," JQR, o.s., 5 (1892-93): 375-398. Emil Schürer, History 3 (1896): 114-124; Geschichte 3 (1909): 339-356. Wilhelm Bousset, "Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen," ZNW 1 (1900): 141-175; 187-209; 334-346. Bousset was critical of Schnapp's method and sought, on the basis of the comparison of various texts, to show that the interpolations are fewer than Schnapp had indicated. His work was nonetheless in support of the Grabe-Schnapp hypothesis. Leonard Pass and J. Arendzen, "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," JQR, o.s., 12 (1900): 651-661. The authors attempted to show a pre-Christian date and thus subsequent Christian interpolation. See similar studies by Conybeare, JQR, o.s., 8 (1896): 260-168; 471-485, and Kohler, JQR, o.s., 5 (1893): 399-406.

[5] E. J. Bickerman, "The Date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," JBL 69 (1950): 247.

[6] Marianus de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin (Assen, Netherlands: Koninklijde van Gorcum & Comp., N. V., 1953).

Testaments as a product of the Jewish community of Qumran.[7]

What our purpose is and is not must be kept in mind. It is not to write a history of research on the Testaments.[8] This has given a degree of freedom to the way we have sampled the literature in order to present the representative materials. Our purpose is to detect and evaluate the various methods of bracketing passages as Christian in what purports to be a Jewish document. Narrowly defined, both the period before Schnapp, and the more recent period that has sought the link between the Testaments and "Jewish-Qumran" could be omitted, since in neither period was the question one of interpolation. So narrowly to define the purpose, would be however self-defeating. As was stated in the introduction, to ask "on what methodological grounds is such-and-such a passage labeled a Christian interpolation?" logically leads one to ask "on what grounds is it rejected or not even considered as Christian?" In this essay the emphasis falls on the development of evidence for the interpolation theory, but both questions, nonetheless, have been kept in mind. Thus, the material will be organized into three sections. First, the consensus for Christian origin held in the period between Grabe and Schnapp will be briefly sketched. Second, the hypothesis of Christian interpolation will be outlined in some detail. In the last section, brief mention will be made of the major developments since R. H. Charles--namely, the work of de Jonge who sought to revive the earlier position of a Christian origin for the Testaments and the view that sees the Testaments as Qumran material.

---

[7] André Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, trans. from the French by R. D. Barnett (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., Ltd., 1954). Marc Philonenko, Les Interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qoumrân (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960).

[8] For a thorough study of the history of research, see: Howard Dixon Slingerland, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A History of Research with Attendant Conclusions. Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1973).

Early Research on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

An early assumption: The Testaments a Jewish document

Writing in 1242 about the rediscovery of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs after their complete disappearance six centuries earlier, Matthew of Paris wrote that they "had been for a long time unknown and hidden through the jealousy of the Jews, on account of the prophecies of the Saviour contained in them."[9] He wrote further that the Greeks, "the most unwearied investigators of all writings," had translated the document from Hebrew into Greek. It was this Greek copy that Grosseteste had used to make his Latin translation that brought the Testaments to light after being hidden so long. It seems clear from this early account that the Testaments was accepted as a Jewish document written in Hebrew. Charles concluded that Grosseteste "took the book with all its Christian additions to be a genuine writing of the twelve sons of Jacob."[10]

---

[9] Both Charles, HibJ 3 (1904-05): 559, and Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 865, cited this source: Historia Anglorum, A.D. 1242: vol. iv. p. 232, ed. Luard. Charles dated it 1252, obviously incorrect according to others who refer to it, and cited the author as Matthew of Paris.

The "prophecies" referred to by Matthew of Paris provided the basis for Grabe's rejection of the document as a unified Jewish writing,[11] and, at a later time, led to its ascription to a second century A.D. Jewish -Christian.[12]

The interpolation theory introduced

Since the Testaments purports to be Jewish, and its contents rest on obvious Jewish traditions, in the introduction to his Greek edition of the Testaments (1698), J. E. Grabe concluded that the author must have been a Jew. Yet, Grabe recognized clearly Christian passages (e.g., T. Levi 18).

---

[10] Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 283. Grosseteste's conclusion can perhaps be called a pre-critical assessment, but it is far from surprising. In early stages of research, many texts were assumed to be what they claimed to be. This is seen, for example, in the early Ascension of Isaiah research. (See the essay on the Ascension of Isaiah in this study.)

[11] So, Charles, HibJ 3 (1904-05): 559-560.

[12] Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 865ff., held this position. Charles, Testaments (1908), p. xxxviii, and DB(H) 4 (1911): 721, briefly summarized this position and listed those holding it.

He accounted for the presence of both Jewish and Christian elements by an interpolation theory; i.e., it was a Jewish work interpolated by Christians. That the entire document was Christian seemed impossible to him because of the warlike characteristics attributed to the Messiah.[13] His position, however, received no support from scholars of his day.[14]

The Testaments Seen as a Christian Document

Shortly after the publication of Grabe's work, discussions appeared that asserted that the Testaments was a product of Christianity written in Greek.[15] It was, however, Corrodi's work in 1781 which apparently set the directions of Testaments research which would vary little for the next hundred years.[16] He saw no problem in the warlike description of the Messiah contained in the Testaments. He agreed with Grabe that the Testaments contained both Jewish tradition and Christian ideas, but concluded that the writer must have been a Jewish Christian, probably of the second century. He argued that once this premise is accepted, the Jewish tradition of the Messiah offers no difficulty but is, in fact, similar to that found in the New Testament Book of Revelation.[17] Although Corrodi's position was built on an obviously faulty premise--namely, a document which contains both Jewish and Christian material is a product of a Christian writer--it nonetheless spearheaded a century of consensus that the Testaments was a Christian writing. Until Schnapp's reintroduction of the interpolation theory in 1884, the debates thus centered primarily on the question of Gentile (Pauline)--or Jewish-Christian authorship.

---

[13] Spicilegium SS. Patrum I, 129ff.

[14] Almost every introduction to the Testaments makes this point.

[15] Slingerland, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 6, cites two such discussions. D. Le Nourry, writing ca. 1700, concluded from the large amount of Christian material in the document that it was the work of someone in the church, cited in J.-P. Migne (ed.), Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca, II (Paris: Paul Dupont, 1886): 1024-1030. Johan. Albertus Frabricius (ed.), Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti, I (2nd. ed.; Hamburg: Theodori Christoph. Felginer, 1722): 759 (the first edition appeared in 1713), had argued from the Greek style of the Testaments for a date near that of Hermas and the Sibyllines. Charles, Testaments (1908), pp. xxxviii-xli, cited neither of these in his survey of "critical inquiries"; his discussion begins with Grabe followed immediately by Corrodi. See Schnapp, Die Testamente der zwolf Patriarchen, p. 11.

The first study to appear devoted specifically to the Testaments was C. I. Nitzsch's De Testamentis duodecim Patriarchorum in 1810.[18] According to Nitzsch, the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament contain Christian, Christian interpolated, and Jewish-Christian writings; he included in this latter group IV Esdras, the Psalms of Solomon, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.[19] He interpreted T. Levi 16:4 as a reference to the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D., and, since the Testaments were apparently known to Origen and Tertullian, he dated it as an early second century writing.[20] This post-apostolic date plus the obvious Christian elements (e.g. the messianic description in T. Levi 18) confirmed for him its Christian origin.[21] He offered further evidence to support his argument that the author was a Jewish Christian probably of Alexandria whose thought was influenced by Essene ideas: (1) its parallels to Philo of Alexandria, both in ideas (e.g., the supremacy of priesthood over kingship) and vocabulary (e.g., common Greek philosophical terms such as, διαθέσεις, αἰσθέσις, φύσις, Τέλος)[22]; (2) its frequent use of allegory[23]; (3) its eclectic philosophical elements drawn from Mithraism, Pythagoreanism, Stoicism, and the Academy; and (4) its Essene asceticism.[24]

---

[16] [Heinrich Corrodi], Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus, II (Leipzig: [n.n.]): 101-103. Slingerland, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 7, makes this point on the significance of Corrodi's work; so, also, Charles, DB(H) 4 (1911): 721; HibJ 3 (1904-05): 560; Testaments (1908), p. xxxviii.

[17] Corrodi, Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus, II, pp. 101-103.

---

[18] C. I. Nitzsch, De Testamentis duodecim Patriarchorum libro V.T. Pseudepigrapho (Wittenberg: ex officina tyographica Friderici Immanuelis Siebt., 1810), I am indebted to Slingerland, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, pp. 8-10, for the summary of Nitzsch's work.

[19] Nitzsch, pp. 1-13, as summarized in Slingerland.

[20] Ibid., p. 17. [21] Ibid., p. 16.

[22] The use of such Greek terms is also used in his argument for Greek as the original language, p. 16.

Another work that argued for Jewish-Christian authorship for the Testaments is a massive theological study by J. A. Dorner in 1845.[25] Dorner likened the Testaments to the Epistle to the Hebrews with its emphasis on Christ as High Priest. He argued that the author addresses Judaism and

> unweariedly reminds the Jews that the Messiah is above all to be conceived as a priest, to whom the old priesthood is called upon to resign its rights.[26]

He maintained that the question, whether the author were a Jew or a Christian, could with certainty be answered, since the idea of Christ's eternal Priesthood is central in each of the Twelve Testaments.[27]

---

[23] Cf. the discussion by Joseph Langen, Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi (Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1866), pp. 140-157, in which he argued for Palestinian origin because of the stress placed on history rather than allegory (p. 144).

[24] Nitzsch, De Testamentis duodecim Patriarchorum, pp. 17-27. Nitzsch maintained that the same evidence pointed to Alexandria as the place of writing. After his consideration of Nitzsch's treatment of the Testaments, Slingerland, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 10, concluded: "His arguments for Jewish-Christian authorship were more implicit than explicit, based as they were upon similarities between the ideas of the Testaments and those of the Essenes."

[25] J. A. Dorner, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, trans. William Lindsay Alexander, I (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1861). The date cited here is that of the 2nd edition of the German text. The English translation appeared in 1861; the text used for this essay was the 1878 printing of this translation.

[26] Ibid., p. 419.

Dorner's interpretation of the Testament of Joseph illustrates his approach to the entire body of Testaments literature.

> The fundamental thought of the entire Testament of Joseph (xi. 18, xii. 3) is the following: Joseph is a type of the suffering Christ;--apart from this thought, its entire composition is a mystery. Now the Testament of Joseph is for the most part the goal of the rest. The idea seems to have been, so to group the sons of Jacob around Joseph, that he should be the object of the hatred of them all in their manifold sins, and yet whilst apparently perishing at their hands, be their deliverer. His history thus becomes a type of the history of Christ, who suffers in consequence of the sins of His people, in order, as the atoning Lamb, which is at the same time King, to bring spiritual redemption. The dying Jacob interprets the type, and sets it forth for coming times, so that no one, when Christ comes, may fail to see in Him the Reconciler.[28]

Although Dorner recognized that the morality and the doctrine of sin found in the Testaments, (e.g., Zebulun i.;

---

[27] Ibid., p. 421.

[28] Ibid., p. 421. Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr. (ed.), Studies on the Testament of Joseph. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 5 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975). I have not examined this volume in detail, but it appears to be highly suggestive and indeed realistic in its approach to the Testaments literature. These essays make clear the error in earlier studies like Dorner's, which assumed Christian origin and built entire interpretations upon such assumptions.

Reuben ii.) "bear traces of a Judaizing tendency," he nonetheless maintained that "a separation of the Christian element is impossible, for the fundamental idea and the entire conception of the work is Christian." So, Dorner concluded: "The author was a Jewish Christian;--assuming this, the Judaizing elements are explained."[29]

Dorner's discussion is for the most part a composite picture of the person and work of Christ drawn from various passages.[30] For example, passages are cited from the Testaments which, he felt, spoke of God's revelation in Jesus, his birth, life among men, death, resurrection, and the final judgment. He contended that the Testaments speak specifically of such things as the Messiah's virgin birth (T. Joseph 19), the God of Israel appearing on earth as a man (T. Sim. 6), God coming in the flesh (T. Benj. 10), the messiah as the Saviour of the world (T. Levi 10); and the like. Further, he believed that T. Benj. 11. "unquestionably refers to Paul" and used this as evidence of "the untenableness of the opinion, that Jewish Christians as such were Ebionitical, or, at all events, anti-Pauline".[31] He also suggested that the document showed "many Johannean features"--

---

[29] Ibid. Here again is seen Corrodi's faulty premise. If one does not begin with the assumption of a Jewish-Christian, what directions are then open?

[30] Ibid., pp. 154-157.

[31] Ibid., p. 421.

for example, the use of the phrase "the Lamb of God", and the fact that μονογενής is used of Christ (T. Benj. 9).[32]

Both Nitzsch and Dorner had written--although from different approaches--in favor of Jewish-Christian authorship. Albrecht Ritschl (1850) opposed this position and defended a Gentile-Christian origin of the Testaments.[33] He set forth the following evidence: (1) the clearly favorable reference to Paul in T. Benj. 11:1ff; (2) the fact that Gentile-Christians, like Jewish-Christians, are interested in commands, sin, the seven heavens, and the Watchers;[34]

---

[32] The phrase "lamb of God" is found several times in the Testaments; e.g., T. Jos. 19:11; T. Benj. 3:8. Dorner cited simply Test. xi. xii.; xi.19, obviously an error by oversight or printing. Charles (APOT 2) bracketed almost all of Dorner's references as Christian interpolations. In short, Dorner's method illustrates the tendency to read a text for what we believe it to be--viz., the Testaments in Dorner's opinion was a Christian document, so it must be read as such. With this assumption, there are no problems in the text which cannot be accounted for on the basis of the assumption.

[33] Albrecht Ritschl, Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche (Bonn: Adolph-Marcus, 1850), pp. 324-325. Charles, Testaments (1908), p. xxxix, and DB(H) 4 (1911): 721, maintained that Ritschl's interpretation of T. Benj. 11:1ff. as clearly refering to Paul was his main reason for his Gentile-Christian approach to the document. See the discussion above on Dorner's defense of this passage even in what he contended to be a Jewish-Christian writing (Dorner, pp. 421-422).

[34] It seems most evident here that Ritschl wrote specifically against Dorner's position. Cf. Dorner, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, pp. 419-422, especially p. 421, where he speaks of "a Judaizing tendency." Ritschl contended that these were points held not only by Jewish-Christians, but by Gentile-Christians as well.

(3) the Law in the Testaments is not cultic but ethical; and (4) Abraham (not Moses) is the key figure in the Testaments, as in Paul.

They agreed that Grabe was wrong, and that the Testaments was a Christian writing. There was, however, disagreement as to the type of Christian author revealed in the text. The conflicting conclusions set forth by Grabe, Dorner, and Ritschl called attention to the question of the makeup of the document. Falling back on Grabe's theory of interpolation, A. Kayser (1851) sought by literary-critical methods to answer both sides of the debate.[35]

Kayser began his discussion in agreement with Grabe that the work of two writers could be detected in the Testaments. There the agreement ended. Kayser assumed the Christian origin of the Testaments and believed its purpose was to instruct the Jews in ethics and the Christian messianic future.[36] He saw the issue in terms of Christian authorship-Gentile (Pauline)-or Jewish--Christian?[37]

---

[35] A. Kayser, "Die Testamente der XII Patriarchen," Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften in Verbindung mit der theologischen Gessellschaft zu Strassburg, 3 (1851): 107-140. I was not able to locate this volume. The analysis of Kayser's study is taken from Slingerland, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: History of Research, pp. 12-14, and Sinker, "Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum," DCB 4 (1887): 866-867, 870-871. Cf. Schnapp, Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen, pp. 12-13. My attention was first called to Kayser's work by the one sentence in Charles, DB(H) 4 (1911): 421, ". . . Kayser . . . who, falling back on Grabe's theory of interpolation, traced the book to Ebionitic circles." Here was one who rejected Grabe's theory, assumed Christian origin for the Testaments, and yet used the interpolation theory to answer the question of conflicting elements in the text. The textual- and literary-critical methods introduced by Kayser were later brought to prominence in the work of Schnapp and Charles. The methods were basically the same; the conclusions were entirely different.

Kayser maintained that the Testaments were strongly nationalistic because of the priority assigned to Israel as a Shemite race and the destruction of certain non-Shemite races (T. Sim. 6). The only parallel to the Ham/Shem materials is found in the Kerygma Petri (Clementine Recognitions I. 30, 32, 33), an Ebionite document. He found other evidences of Ebionite Jewish-Christianity in the Testaments: (1) the parallel between Christ and Moses (T. Levi 8; Recognitions I. 41, 57); (2) the Ebionite view that Jesus is the "only-born prophet" (T. Benj. 9); (3) the priestly emphasis on Jesus in the Testaments; (4) in T. Levi 9 a trace of the Ebionite ritual of bathing; (5) the use of salt in the Eucharist, an allusion to the Ebionite Eucharist (cf. Clementine Homilies xiv. 1).[38]

---

[36] Ibid., p. 100. Cf. Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 865-867, 870. See Deane, Pseudepigrapha (1981), p. 178, who also contended that the writer, a Christian, aimed at "the conversion of his auditors to Christianity."

[37] Ibid., pp. 119-120, 128. Cf. Sinker, Ibid., pp. 866-867, 870, 873, who summarized Kayser's evidence and sought to refute it.

[38] On the priestly emphasis on Jesus in the Testaments, see the discussion of Dorner's position given earlier. For the Ebionite ritual of bathing, Kayser cited Recognitions iv. 3, v. 36.

Kayser contended that the Testaments contained a two-fold Christology. On the one hand, Jesus is a man set aside by the Holy Spirit at his baptism (T. Naph. 4; T. Levi 16, 18; T. Judah 24); this is Ebionite. On the other hand, the Messiah comes as God in the likeness of man (T. Levi 2; T. Sim. 6; T. Asher 7); this is patripassionistic. Having identified what he concluded to be both Ebionite Jewish-Christian materials and Gentile-Christian materials, Kayser concluded that the original writing was Ebionite; the God-man and patripassionistic elements were Gentile-Christian interpolations.[39]

Another approach to Christian authorship came when Robert Sinker published his Greek text of the Testaments in 1869 arguing that it was a product of Nazarene-Jewish Christianity.[40] He rejected the interpolation theory and presented evidence which he felt proved his idea of Christian authorship.[41] According to him, the Testaments was originally written in Greek at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century A.D.[42] Its obvious intention was the conversion of the Jews.[43] Of the three elements of the book (historical, ethical, and prophetical), he believed that the prophetical was "the most important in the writer's mind."[44]

---

[39] Kayser, "Die Testamente," pp. 113-114. Cf. Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel,^{2} 7 (1859): 327-333, who saw the author as a Gentile Christian (on the basis of T. Benj. 11) who stressed levitical interests. See Sinker's discussion on this point, DCB 4 (1887): 870-872. See also, G. R. Beasley-Murray, "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," JThS 48 (1947): 1-12.

[40] See especially Sinker's essay "On the Parties of the Early Church," in The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1869), pp. 8-16.

[41] The summary here is from Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 865-874.

Sinker wrote that the writer of the Testaments

> lived evidently in evil times, as we may see from the constant predictions of calamities put into the mouths of the patriarchs. They look forward beyond the troubles to the happy days of the coming deliverer; so doubtless the writer's aim was to show the true purpose of those evil times, how by adversity the Jews may be brought to acknowledge the Messiah, whom, though they had rejected him, their fathers foretold. Thus aiming at the conversion of the Jewish nation to the Christian faith, the writer bases his appeal not on the law of Moses, but on the earlier patriarchal covenant, underlying which were latent the first germs of Christianity.[45]

---

[42] Ibid., p. 867. [43] Ibid., p. 870.

[44] Ibid., p. 866. Cf. Schürer, History 3 (1896): 114-115, for a summary of these three elements. Schnapp (1884) concluded that most of this third element was due to interpolations, both Jewish and Christian.

[45] Ibid. Cf. John E. H. Thomson, Books Which Influenced Our Lord (1891), pp. 355-359, and William J. Deane, Pseudepigrapha (1891), pp. 162-192, who both saw the writer as "a Nazarene." (Thomson described him further as "an Essene who had become a Christian," who sought, through the fathers, to win the Jews to the Christian faith, which indeed was spoken of prophetically by the fathers.)

This popular narrative form was important in Sinker's interpretation of the Testaments. Thus, although he freely admitted that some passages dealing with "the Nature of our Lord" seemed contradictory, he adamantly rejected the theory of interpolation which he labeled a "most convenient, but most dangerous tool." He felt that the difficulty could be just as sensibly explained in terms of the narrative in which the message is presented. It is "not a theological code, but a religious essay in a popular form."[46] Regarding two sets of references to the Messiah (those speaking of him as man and those referringto him as God in the form of man) he noted simply that the author, "having a practical object in view, dwells now on one aspect of our Lord's nature, and now on the other."[47]

In a discussion of these passages, Sinker noted that there are only three passages in which the Testaments refer to the Messiah in his human aspect: T. Levi 16, T. Jud. 24, and T. Naph. 4. This small number "is suggestive" and indicates that the humanity of Christ, as such, was not the main point the writer was trying to make. He believed that even in these passages the writer saw something "more in human nature generally." For example, T. Levi 16.3, though calling him "man" and speaking of his death, speaks also of his "resurrection."[48] He argued further that there seems to be no reason to bracket the God-man phrases as interpolations (e.g., T. Simeon 4.7, 7.2), other than that "such an omission is necessary for the theory of the Ebionite origin of the book." Some of these (e.g., T. Levi 4.1) may illustrate "the tendency to Patripassionism in the Nazarene theology."[49] Sinker admitted that at points there may be the possibility of some corruption of the text, but contended that "though one or two passages may be corrupt, there are no sufficient grounds for doubting the genuineness of the mass of them." He maintained that most of the passages in question are found in all the known MSS and "few can be struck out without seriously dislocating the text."[50]

---

[46] Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 870.

[47] Ibid.

The Jewish nature of the Testaments is clearly indicated by an emphasis on the Law, Jewish ethics, Levi and Judah, the patriarchs, and other details such as its mention of seven heavens and the angelic watchers.[51] Sinker contended that there is nothing here that conflicts with the element of Jewish Christianity known as the Nazarenes.[52] The Nazarenes held firmly to their Jewish practices, but in no way sought to impose them on Gentile converts. They held high views as to the nature of Christ and were favorable to Paul's mission among the Gentiles.[53] Other points favoring Nazarene origin of the Testaments are noted by Sinker. (1) The author sees in the Christian dispensation no abrogating of the law, but a legitimate development of it. (2) He stresses the duty of benevolence to the poor, the blessedness of poverty, and the danger of covetousness. (3) He warns of the danger of female attractions and of wine.

---

[48] Ibid. Notice that Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 313, bracketed this passage as an interpolation and noted a textual variant on "resurrection"; Charles chose the variant, "dignity."

[49] Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 871. (In his review of Sinker's 1869 edition of the Testaments, A. Hilgenfeld, ZWT 14 (1871): 302-305, maintained that the patripassionism of the Testaments could not have come from any kind of Jewish Christian.)

[50] Ibid. Sinker referred to the Armenian version in his discussion of T. Benj. 11, the reference to Paul. Since, at the time only one such MS was known, he wrote that "it is rather dangerous to rest a case on the evidence of a single MS., from which three whole Testaments, those of Reuben, Naphtali and Dan, are altogether wanting" (p. 872).

---

[51] Ibid., p. 866. See also Sinker's 1869 edition of the Testaments, pp. 16-26.

[52] See the discussion of the Nazarenes and the Ebionites in J. A. Dorner, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, pp. 188-217. George Foot Moore, Judaism 1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927; reissued in 1966), p. 90, wrote of the Nazarenes: "Their peculiarity was the belief that the Messiah foretold in the Scriptures had appeared in the reign of Tiberius in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, . . . For the rest they were pious and observant Jews, who worshipped in the temple and in the synagogues like others. . . . The Jews had no doctrine about the Messiah invested with the sanction of orthodoxy, and on the fundamental articles of Judaism, the unity of God, his peculiar relation to Israel, the revelation of his character, will, and purpose in Scripture, the Nazarenes were as sound as any Jews could be."

[53] Sinker, DCB 4 (1887): 866.

(4) He insists on the importance of fasting.[54] He concluded his discussion by emphasizing again--in direct opposition to Kayser's position of Ebionite origin for the Testaments--the Christian mission among the Gentiles:

> No Ebionite (in the restricted sense of the word) could maintain the doctrine of the salvation of all the heathen, set forth so fully and freely by the author of the Testaments.[55]

This survey of the earlier period has not been exhaustive, but representative. The works mentioned indicate the general contours and shifts in the study of the Testaments. The obvious can be summed up by reference to these shifts: from Grosseteste's assumption of a genuine writing by the twelve sons of Jacob, to Grabe's suggestion of an original Jewish writing with later Christian interpolations, to the period of consensus that the document was Christian, notwithstanding the endless disputes over the kind of Christian (Gentile? Jewish [Ebionite?] [Nazarene?]?).

Not-so-obvious, but perhaps more significant, is the all-important question of the proper approach to a text. On what basis can a text be labeled as Jewish with Christian interpolations? Or, to put it another way, in dealing with a text in its final form, how can one distinguish between an original Jewish document which has Christian interpolations and a Christian writing which has utilized Jewish traditions?[56]

---

[54] Ibid. Some of these same points are stressed by those who relate the Testaments to the Qumran community.

[55] Ibid., p. 867. Sinker pointed out as "very suggestive" the reference to the tearing of the temple veil at Christ's death "as the act in which the spirit of God went over to the heathen" (p. 867).

The Interpolation Theory

The interpolation theory has come to be associated with men like Friedrich Schnapp, Emil Schürer, and R. H. Charles, in whose works Grabe's theory was revived, defended, and popularized. It was the publication of Schnapp's *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht*[57] that revived and gave prominence to Grabe's theory that the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs was a Jewish writing which had been interpolated by Christians, a theory which has dominated Testaments study to the present day. We will sketch in some detail the lines of evidence for the interpolation theory and seek to determine the methodology underlying this position.

The interpolation theory re-introduced: the work of Friedrich Schnapp

Schnapp attempted to identify inner contradictions within the text, and by means of these sought to separate the original text from the later additions.[58] He began his study with a brief survey of the work of those who had advocated the Christian origin of the Testaments and noted that in almost every case the divergent conclusions rested upon conflicting materials within the Testaments which called for the omission of certain passages in order to smooth out the contradictions.[59] He concluded that the text of the Testaments could not be considered a unity but rather an original writing containing later interpolations.[60]

---

[56] See, for example, Burkitt's approach to the Ascension of Isaiah, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914), pp. 44-48. The acuteness of the problem is also seen in de Jonge's work which will be discussed later in this essay.

[57] Schnapp, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1884).

Schnapp used T. Levi for his model and detailed analysis[61]; his conclusions were then applied briefly to the other Testaments. The introduction to T. Levi concerns itself with the future, whereas the others, for example, T. Reuben, begin with ethical exhortations. This future orientation signalled, according to Schnapp, the presence of later additions to the text.[62] Similarly, T. Levi 2-5 has the same emphasis on the future and stands in sharp contrast to ch. 6, which turns to biographical material about the patriarch.[63] It is labeled, also, as a later addition to the original text. He concluded that the original T. Levi ended with ch. 13. Moreover, T. Levi 8, 10, 14-19, like chs. 1-5, place major emphasis on the future. Further, all of these sections (chs. 2-5, 8, 10, 14-19) contain material of a clearly Christian nature.[64]

---

[58] Ibid., pp. 11-14. Both Langen, Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi (Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1866), p. 144, and Sinker (see the discussion on his position above) had insisted that the Christian materials were woven into the context of the document and could not be bracketed without disrupting the continuity of the text.

[59] Ibid., pp. 5-14. Cf. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 1953, pp. 9-11, who began his discussion at the same point.

[60] Ibid., p. 11. This was essentially the same conclusion reached earlier by Grabe.

[61] Ibid., pp. 14-43. He concluded that only T. Gad was preserved in its original form. Schürer was cautious on this point and stated that "perhaps" Gad was an exception to the usual pattern of predictions found at the end of each Testament, History 3 (1896): 115. Charles, The Greek Version of the Testaments (1908), p. xlvi, listed T. Gad viii.2 as a first century B.C. Jewish addition to the text; so, his textual note, APOT 2 (1913), p. 342. Also bracketed in a textual variant is 2:3, which he noted showed Christian influence, APOT 2 (1913): 340. Several other T. Gad passages were described as glosses (e.g., 5:7 and 6:5).

Schnapp's analysis led to several conclusions. First, the original Jewish composition consisted of the biographical narratives of the patriarchs and the accompanying moral exhortations.[65] Although Schnapp did not specifically discuss the purpose of the original Testaments, he seems to have assumed that it was to present moral and ethical ideas--i.e., homiletical Midrash; Haggadic materials.[66] The large amount of obvious Jewish tradition, the similarity of the Testaments to each other (i.e., the historical groundwork of the patriarch's life and the moral exhortations drawn from it), the sense of continuity when only these sections are included, and the sharp contrasts presented by the apocalyptic (interpolated?) elements, provided what appeared to be adequate foundation for this assumption.[67]

---

[62] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[63] Both the future emphasis and the contrast to ch. 6 are obvious to even the casual reader of the text. See Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 304ff.

[64] Schnapp, Die Testamente, pp. 23-29. Schnapp labeled this "a second interpolator," since he interpreted the future-oriented materials as two layers, the first was Jewish, the second (and later), Christian.

[65] Ibid., p. 15.

---

[66] See George Foot Moore, Judaism, vol. 1, pp. 161ff., 190-193, for a discussion of the significance of this kind of Jewish writing. Moore (p. 161) quoted Sifre on Deut. 11, 22: "Those who interpret the implications (of Scripture) say: If you would learn to know Him at whose word the world came into being, learn Haggadah for by this means you will come to know the Holy One and cleave to his ways." He added: "The high aim of the Haggadah is religious and moral instruction and edification; but its authors are aware that to catch and hold the attention it must make itself interesting, and it is not beneath its dignity to be entertaining" (p. 162). See also Kaufmann Kohler, "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada: A--The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," JQR, o.s., 5 (1893): 399-406; R. Travers Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha, pp. 233-243. Although Deane, Pseudepigrapha, pp. 162-192, argued for Christian authorship of the Testaments, his summary demonstrated how the writer drew on the lives of the patriarchs to challenge his readers toward life on a higher plane.

[67] Bousset, ZNW 1 (1900): 141-175; 187-209; 334-346, later criticized Schnapp for arbitrarily blocking out the apocalyptic sections as later Jewish additions and for failing to utilize more extensively the Armenian version in his search for the original text. Bousset's work rested on the comparison of various textual witnesses to determine the original. Later attempts were made by Charles based on F. C. Conybeare's work with the Armenian text, JQR, o.s., 13 (1901): 111-127; 258-274.

Schnapp drew a second conclusion: This original document was later reworked by a second Jewish writer, who wrote of the future destinies of the various tribes and added other apocalyptic details. He claimed that the Jewish interpolations were characterized, with little variation in each of the Testaments, by an appeal to the Book of Enoch (in most cases) and the use of similar ideas concerning apostasy, repentance, and turning back to God.[68] He believed also that the glorification of Levi, found in several of these sections (e.g., T. Reuben 6:8ff.), could have come only from the later Jewish interpolator.[69] He noted, too, that the interpolator generally took passages in which the patriarch has warned his family of a single vice and turned them into specific predictions of the depravity and ungodliness of the tribe (cf., T. Levi 13 with ch. 10 and chs. 14ff.; also, T. Jud. 19 with ch. 23.)[70] Schnapp pointed to various conflicts within the text which he concluded could be explained only in terms of two layers of material. Examples are: the conflicting accounts in T. Joseph 1-10a and 10b-18, the disparity between T. Benjamin 2:1-2 and 2:3-5 (cf. T. Zebulun 4:10), the large apocalyptic sections of T. Levi 2-5 and 8 that stand in sharp contrast to the narrative, and T. Dan. 5, where in adjoining sentences Levi is both commended and denounced.[71]

---

[68] See Schnapp's discussion of T. Naphtali, Die Testamente, 1884, pp. 70-73.

[69] Ibid., p. 50. Cf. Schürer's discussion on this point, History 3 (1896): 119-120.

[70] Ibid., p. 50.

Within the Jewish additions, Schnapp described a third layer of material--viz., further interpolations made by a second interpolator, a Christian.[72]

In his translation of 1900, Schnapp indicated (by the use of small bold type) the following to be Christian interpolations:[73]

T. Reuben	6:8
	6:11
	6:12
T. Simeon	6:5
	6:7c-7:3
T. Levi	2:11
	4:1
	4:4[74]

---

[71] APAT 2 (1900): 460, and Schnapp, Die Testamente, 1884, pp. 76ff. Cf. Sinker's explanation of the Joseph passages as "a double documentary origin," DCB 4 (1887): 869.

[72] Schnapp, Die Testamente, pp. 23, 28, 29, 31. For a summary of these three sections, see Schürer, History 3 (1896): 114-115. The apocalyptic sections which Schnapp labeled as later additions to the original was seen by Sinker as the most significant, DCB 4 (1887): 866.

[73] These are from Schnapp's translation of the Testaments in Kautzsch, APAT 2 (1900): 400ff. In some cases only a phrase or part of a sentence is blocked out as interpolated.

[74] Cf. Charles's reading, APOT 2 (1913), p. 307. A^{a} (one recension of the Armenian) reads: "And it shall come to pass in the last days that God shall send [His Son] to save the created things [and thy sons shall lay hands on and crucify Him]." Charles noted that $a\beta A^{\beta}S$ also have the last clause; he omitted it as "an obvious Christian addition."

	8:12-15
	10:2
	14:2
	14:4[75]
	16:3-4
	16:5b
	17:2b
	18:3a[76]
	18:7
	18:9
T. Judah	24:1
	24:4
T. Issachar	7:7
T. Zebulun	8:2
	9:8
T. Dan	5:10-12
	5:13c, d
	6:6-7
	6:9
	7:3
T. Naphtali	4:5b
	8:2-3
T. Gad	8:1-2
T. Asher	7:3
T. Joseph	19:8-12
T. Benjamin	3:7-8
	9:2-5
	10:7b
	10:8b
	10:9b
	11:2-5

Schnapp's method rested entirely upon a close examination of the text of the Testaments. He sought to identify the various blocks of material, those which gave a degree of uniformity and unity to the entire document (i.e., the historical narratives and ethical exhortations), and those which stood in sharp contrast to their contexts (i.e., the predictive and apocalyptic elements). Within these sections, which Schnapp had determined were Jewish, he identified the Christian interpolations. Two principles seem to underlie his bracketing of these passages as Christian: first, in most cases, they are fairly obvious; and, second, they can be omitted without disrupting the unity of the text or destroying its main point. For example:[77] "For the Lord our God shall appear on earth [as man] . . ." (T. Sim. 6:5). Again: "[Because God hath taken a body and eaten with men and saved men.]" (T. Sim. 6:7c). Obvious also are the phrases in T. Levi 10:2, "[against the Saviour of the world, Christ, acting godlessly]," and T. Levi 14:2, "For our father Israel is pure from the transgressions of the chief priests [who shall lay their hands upon the Saviour of the World]." Other passages which have incarnational emphasis are also designated as Christian--e.g., T. Zebulun 9:8, T. Dan 5:13.

---

[75] Cf. Charles, APOT 2: 312, who translated it "the light of the law"; Schnapp's reading is "das Licht der Welt."

[76] Cf. Charles, APOT 2: 314, who omitted the phrase "until his ascension." See Schnapp's discussion, Die Testamente, p. 36.

Some passages, however, are not so obvious. Schnapp discussed several passages which he maintained reminded the reader of the death of Jesus--e.g., T. Levi 14 and 16.[78]

---

[77] The passages are quoted from Charles, APOT 2 (1913).

[78] On this point, it can be noted, too, that some phrases which, according to Charles, show Christian influence (e.g., T. Levi 8:5, "bread and wine," and T. Gad 2:3, "for thirty pieces of gold . . ."), Schnapp did not note as particularly significant.

T. Levi 18:6-7 reminds the reader of the manifestation of the voice and the Spirit at the baptism of Jesus. This passage demonstrates how the interpolator takes a general messianic reference (cf. Isaiah 11:2) and, with the addition of the phrase, "in the water," makes it a specific designation. The entire passage deals with "the new priest" whom God will raise up (18:1-2). His star will appear in the heaven "as of a king" (18:3, bracketed by both Schnapp and Charles). The passage reads in full:[79]

> 6. The heavens shall be opened,
> And from the temple of glory
> shall come upon him
> sanctification.
> With the Father's voice as
> from Abraham to Isaac.
> 7. And the glory of the most
> High shall be uttered over him,
> And the spirit of understanding
> and sanctification shall rest
> upon him [in the
> water].

Scholars who followed Schnapp disagreed with some of his methods as well as some of his conclusions. Very few, however, disagreed with the main point of his research--viz., the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is of Jewish origin and contains later Christian interpolations. Later scholars, citing textual evidence, were able to demonstrate even more clearly than Schnapp the validity of the interpolation theory.

---

[79] The reading is from Charles, APOT 2 (1913): 314.

Acceptance and popularization of Schnapp's thesis

After Schnapp several other scholars provided evidence of both acceptance and defense of the interpolation theory.

Emil Schürer.--Although J. M. S. Baljon was the first to affirm the views of Schnapp,[80] it was not until the publication of Emil Schürer's *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* that Schnapp's position was taken seriously.[81] Schürer's brief discussion was not an in-depth one but a simple resume and affirmation of the interpolation theory.

Schürer acknowledged that some scholars had seen the Testaments as the work of a Christian author because it "contains a great many direct allusions to the incarnation of God in Christ."[82] Schürer argued that this could hardly be the case. With this, he described the "heterogeneous character" of the Testaments contending that it contains materials, on the one hand, which can be understood only "on the assumption that they were composed by a Jewish author," yet, on the other hand, there are "numerous passages which can only have been written by a Christian."[83] He saw its Jewishness in several features: (1) the Haggadean Midrash style in the presentation of the history of the patriarchs; (2) the author's assumption that salvation is in store only for the children of Shem, while the children of Ham are doomed to destruction (Simeon vi); (3) his interest in the Jewish tribes--he deplores their apostasy; he exhorts them to cleave to the tribes of Judah and Levi (Reuben vi., Judah xxi., Issachar v., Dan v., Naphtali v. and viii.); he clings to the hope of their ultimate conversion and deliverance; (4) his emphasis upon the priestly sacrificial worship as a divinely appointed institution (Levi ix.).[84]

---

[80] J. M. S. Baljon, "De Testamenten der XII Patriarchen," *Theologische Studiën--Utrecht*, 4 (1886): 208-231. That he was the first is maintained by both Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), p. 132, and Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve: History of Research*, p. 32.

[81] Emil Schürer, *History* 3 (1896): 114-122. The German volumes appeared 1886-1890. The volume cited in this study is a 1909 printing; the pagination is the same.

[82] Ibid., p. 114.

Its Christian ideas are demonstrated in (1) the passages which teach the universal character of salvation, (2) the idea that redemption comes through the incarnation of God, and (3) the distinct reference to the Apostle Paul in T. Benjamin xi. Schürer concluded that "the Christology upon which those passages proceed is of a decidedly patripassian character"; e.g., T. Simeon vi., 5, 7: T. Issachar vii. 7; T. Zebulun ix. 8; T. Dan v.13; T. Naphtali

---

[83] Ibid., pp. 115-116.

[84] Ibid.

viii. 3; T. Asher vii. 3; T. Benjamin x.8.[85]

It was unthinkable to Schürer that the book could be of Christian origin. Not even a Jewish-Christian could have written of the tribes of Levi and Judah as those commissioned by God as the leaders of Israel, since they above all others distinguished themselves "in the way of rejecting the gospel."[86] Further, many of the Christian passages "obviously disturb the connection and thus proclaim themselves to be interpolations at the very outset."[87] Finally, the available textual evidence (i.e., the Roman manuscript and the Armenian version) omits the reference to Paul in T. Benjamin xi.[88] Thus, Schürer concluded that the interpolation theory of Grabe and Schnapp offered the only possible solution. He maintained that the Christian interpolator,

> with a Jewish original before him introduced modifications here and there to adapt it to the purposes and needs of the Christian Church.[89]

To Schürer this provided an explanation for the emphasis on both Levi and Judah. Finding in the text before him Levi and Judah as "the chosen and model tribes," the interpolator

---

[85] Ibid., pp. 116-117. All of these are bracketed by both Schnapp and Charles as Christian.

[86] Ibid., p. 118. [87] Ibid., p. 119.

[88] Ibid. [89] Ibid.

> proceeds to justify it from his Christian standpoint by representing Christ as descended from the tribe of Levi in His capacity as priest, and from that of Judah in His capacity as king, . . .[90]

F. C. Conybeare.--The first significant advance beyond the literary-critical method of Schnapp came in 1893 with F. C. Conybeare's article, "On the Jewish Authorship of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs."[91] In this article the interpolation theory, based on internal evidences of conflicts within the text, interrupted continuity, and the like, was given additional support through textual criticism.

Conybeare had discovered in 1891 the Edschmiadzin MS of the Bible which contained the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. He compared this Armenian version with Sinker's Greek text examining those passages that might possibly warrant Sinker's conclusion that the Testaments was one of Christian origin (T. Reuben vi. 8-12; T. Simeon vii. 1-2; T. Levi ii. 9-12, ch. iv., ch. x., ch. viii. 6-12; T. Dan v. 10-13; T. Asher vii. 1-3).[92]

---

[90] Ibid., p. 120. See note on page 120; Schürer wrote that "previous to the author of the Testaments, no writer within the Church had ever directly maintained or in any way emphasized the Levitical descent of Jesus."

[91] F. C. Conybeare, "On the Jewish Authorship of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," JQR, o.s., 5 (1893): 375-398.

[92] Ibid., p. 376-379. The passages cited overlap, entirely or in part, those sections bracketed by Charles, APOT 2 (1913).

For Conybeare, the style of the Greek demands a date for the document no later than the end of the first century. Yet the Testaments contained nothing one might expect from a follower of and believer in Jesus of Nazareth--viz., "some touches, at least some traces, of his historic life lived as a man among his fellow-men."[93] He maintained that one would expect something more definitely Christian even in "the prophetic mood" which characterized this kind of writing. Thus, his question is a valid one: is the Testaments a document written by Christians at so early a date and containing references to a collected New Testament (as Sinker supposed), or is it a pre-Christian writing, which at some later date was adopted and adapted to their needs as Christians (as Grabe had suggested).[94]

Conybeare believed that this question could be answered

> . . . if there can be produced a text, earlier than any yet known of these Testaments, in which the passages upon which those have mainly relied who have upheld the Christian authorship, will be found to be, many of them, altogether lacking, the place of many others occupied by passages of a tendency not distinctly Christian, and often even essentially pre-Christian and Jewish.[95]

To him the ancient Armenian version was such a text. Thus, the point of his discussion!

---

[93] Ibid., p. 380. [94] Ibid., p. 382. [95] Ibid.

Conybeare tested his thesis through a careful examination of special passages, especially comparing them to Sinker's Greek text. As Conybeare predicted, some of the passages are lacking in the Armenian text. For example, in T. Levi ii. 9-12, instead of the words "shalt announce him who is to ransom Israel," the Armenian reads: "shalt announce the salvation of Israel." The words "saving in his own person the whole race of man" are omitted in the Armenian, and he noted: "without any mutilation of the sense."[96] Also lacking in the Armenian is the phrase in T. Judah xxii.2, ἕως παρουσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Conybeare stated that this passage exemplified "the advantages of recovering an old text." Wheras Sinker could only reject the precariousness of the methodology of Vorstman (1857) and others who advocated that the phrase could be omitted without any dislocation of the text, Conybeare had textual evidence for such omissions.[97]

The phrase from T. Judah xxiii.3, "the burning of the temple," is also omitted in the Armenian, and Conybeare observed that with it

> goes one of the arguments for putting the date of the composition of the Testaments after the taking of Jerusalem by Titus in A.D. 70.[98]

---

[96] Ibid., p. 384. [97] Ibid., p. 387.

[98] Ibid., p. 388.

On the other hand, some of the "Christian" passages do appear in the Armenian; e.g., T. Levi iv. Conybeare concluded from this that "it belongs to the earliest and pre-Christian form of the Apocrypha." Conybeare admitted the plausibility that one could still argue that this is interpolated, but concluded:

> If so, we have in the Armenian only an earlier stage of the text, a stage at which interpolation had already begun, but not gone so far as it has in the Greek manuscripts.[99]

Perhaps Conybeare's greatest weakness was that he worked with one Armenian text, which he admitted had various corruptions.[100] He was aware of the Mechitarist MSS in Venice (later used by Charles) which he admitted were more "Christianized" than his own.[101] Despite the weaknesses and devaluing of the Armenian version in recent years,[102] Conybeare's work is still valued as a watershed in Testaments research.

Other significant studies.--Many other significant studies appeared during this period. Both Adolf Harnack and

---

[99] Ibid., p. 384. [100] Ibid., p. 382.

[101] Ibid., p. 397. It was Erwin Preuschen who later tried to assess the relative value of the Armenian texts, "Die armenische Übersetzung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen, ZNW 1 (1900): 106-140.

[102] Especially by de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 1953, who sought to discount almost all evidence of Christian interpolations in an attempt to show Christian origin for the Testaments.

Kaufman Kohler accepted the Jewish origin of the Testaments and in separate studies summarized the various lines of defense supporting this position.[103]

M. Gaster, in 1893, reopened the question of a Hebrew original. Although Charles later wrote that he failed to establish his thesis, he gave Gaster credit for setting a significant direction for future Testaments research.[104]

In 1900, W. Bousset re-examined Schnapp's use of internal evidence in support of the interpolation theory and drew several important conclusions.[105] By an examination of various textual witnesses, he concluded that the Christian interpolations were much fewer and briefer than Schnapp had indicated and, in fact, the Jewish original was not much different from the present text which he attempted to reconstitute.[106] Presupposing such a Jewish original, he argued that there were no grounds for Schnapp's assumption that the apocalyptic sections are interpolations.[107] He maintained, however, that on the basis of internal evidence, later Jewish interpolations of another sort could be seen in the original document--viz., those sections which show a negative evaluation of Levi (e.g., T. Levi 10, 14-16, T. Dan 5). These passages which contradict the usual positive description of Levi (e.g., T. Levi 1-8), he argued, must be later interpolations.[108]

---

[103] Adolf Harnack, Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius 1 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897): 566-570. K[ohler], "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," JE 12 (1906): 113-118. See also, Leonard H. Pass and J. Arendzen, "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," JQR, o.s., 12 (1900): 651-661; R. H. Charles and A. Cowley, "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs," JQR, o.s., 19 (1906-07): 566-583.

[104] M. Gaster, "The Hebrew Text of One of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," Society of Biblical Archeology: Proceedings 16-17 (December 1893): 33-49. The English translation of this text is given in Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 1908, pp. 221-227. See APOT 2 (1913): 287.

[105] W. Bousset, "Die Ausscheidung der christlichen Interpolationen," ZNW 1 (1900): 141-175.

Within this environment of critical scholarship R. H. Charles wrote and eventually emerged as the modern embodiment of the Grabe-Schnapp-Schürer position.

The interpolation theory firmly established: the work of R. H. Charles

Perhaps of all scholars identified with work on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, R. H. Charles is best known. His work on the Testaments began with a brief discussion in 1899, and culminated in his major studies of 1908 and 1913.[109] Charles's genius was in his ability to take the various pieces of past research from here and there and present the whole body of evidence, altered and modified by his own thinking, into what would become a new authority. Very little in his work is new. He was able to take the past and mold it into a new perspective for future scholarship. This he did for Testaments research.

---

[106] Ibid., p. 175.

[107] W. Bousset, "Composition und Zeit der judischen Grundschrift," ZNW 1 (1900): 187-209.

[108] Ibid., pp. 187-189.

[109] "The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs," Encyclopedia Biblica (1899) 1:237-241; The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Oxford:

Charles was convinced that Schnapp was right in his contention that the document was an original Jewish writing containing Christian interpolations. In his support of this position, several features are present in almost every piece of his research on the Testaments.

First, outstanding in Charles's work with the Testaments was his use of other versions. Not content to rest his case entirely on literary criticism as Schnapp had done, he contended that Conybeare's work proved that "when the Armenian version was made, the Greek text was free from several of the Christian interpolations that now deface it."[110] He maintained that with the vast body of materials in the Greek, Armenian, and Slavonic versions, and the Hebrew and Aramaic fragments

> we are able to establish the fact
> that in the Testaments we have a

University Press, 1908); The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (London: A. and C. Black, 1908); APOT 2 (1913): 282-367.

[110] Charles, "The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs," HibJ 3 (1904-05): 561.

> Jewish book that was subsequently interpolated, not by one, but by a series of Christian scribes.[111]

In his several major introductions to the Testaments Charles discussed at considerable length the available MS evidence. The emphasis given to such evidence is seen on almost every page of his critical editions of the text. Although he recognized the weaknesses of the Armenian version, he nonetheless defended its value in isolating Christian interpolations.[112]

Second, Charles was convinced of a plurality of layers of Jewish materials: the original document, and at least two layers of Jewish additions.[113] He fixed the date of the original document on the basis of historical allusions in the text. T. Reuben vi.10-11 refers to a high-priest who is also king; T. Simeon v.5 indicates that he is also a warrior. According to T. Levi viii.14, this priesthood will have a new name. Charles pointed out that "the Maccabean high-priests were the first Jewish priests of the Most High God." He maintained that the Testaments came from a Pharisee; therefore it must have been written before the breach arose between John Hyrcanus and the Pharisees towards the close of the second century B.C. From the threefold title in T. Levi viii.15 (king-priest-prophet), he concluded that "in all Jewish history the triple offices were ascribed to only one individual, John Hyrcanus"; thus he set the date of composition between 137 and 107 B.C. Interpreting T. Levi vi.11 as a probable reference to the destruction of Samaria, he placed the date within much closer limits, between 109-107 B.C.[114]

---

[111] Ibid.

[112] The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (1908), pp. i-xliv.; APOT 2 (1913): 283-289; The Testaments of the Twelve (1908), pp. xxvi-xxvii.

[113] APOT 2 (1913): 289-290, sections 10, 11, and 12.

Into this original, Charles believed the following were Jewish additions made about 70-40 B.C. whose sole purpose was "the overthrow of the Maccabean high-priesthood which in the first century B.C. had become guilty of the most abandoned lewdness and baseness."[115]

T. Levi x, xiv-xvi.
T. Judah xvii.2-xviii.1(?), xxi.6-xxiii, xxiv.4-6.
T. Zebulun ix.
T. Dan v.6-7, vii.3(?).
T. Naphtali iv.
T. Gad viii.2.
T. Asher vii.4-7.

These passages are characterized by several emphases: (1) the nation's apostasy is declared; (2) the destruction of the Temple and a second captivity is predicted; (3) a redemption of the nation either by God Himself or by a

---

[114] Ibid., Charles developed this point in detail in his Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (1908), pp. l-liii.

[115] Ibid. Charles maintained that these passages were in complete agreement with the Psalms of Solomon, which, he concluded, belonged to the same period. They correspond roughly to the future-oriented sections designated by Schnapp as a second layer of materials interpolated into the original document.

Messiah sprung from Judah and a return to their own land is hoped for. Characteristic also of these passages is their frequent citation of the Enoch literature. Since these citations are not found in I Enoch, Charles concluded they probably came from materials which were later embodied in II Enoch.[116]

Charles listed the following also as later Jewish additions whose dates cannot be determined with any accuracy: T. Reuben ii.3-iii.2; T. Levi xvii.1-9; T. Zebulun vi.4-6, vii-viii.3; T. Joseph x.5-xviii. He bracketed these sections primarily because they appeared to be intrusions into the text or are found only in certain MSS due to scribal additions (e.g., T. Reuben vi.7; T. Levi xviii.5^{d}), dittographs (e.g., T. Naphtali v.5), and the like.[117]

A third feature in Charles's work with the Testaments was his emphasis on its influence on Jewish and Christian literature. This "influence" was supported largely on the basis of the early date he assigned to the original document and words and ideas in the Testaments which parallel similar materials in other Jewish and Christian literature. He devoted one page to parallel citations to indicate its influence on Jewish literature, but eighteen pages are devoted to the Church Fathers and the New Testament.[118] He also discussed the more important theological elements of the Testaments (forgiveness, duty of loving God and one's neighbor, universalism, the Messiah, the resurrection, demonology, and the antichrist) which he felt illustrated the influence of the Testaments on New Testament thought.[119] For example, on the theology of forgiveness he declared the Testaments to be "of truly epoch-making importance."[120] He wrote of T. Gad vi.3-7:

---

[116] Ibid.

[117] See, for example, Charles's note on T. Reuben ii.3-iii.2, APOT 2 (1913): 297. In his Greek Versions of the Testaments (1908), p. xlviii, he pointed out the contradictions of the T. Joseph passage to the entire "duty of truthfulness" which is emphatically laid down throughout the Testaments (i.e., Joseph lies several times to protect his brothers: xi. 2, 3, xiii. 6-9, xv. 2-3, xvi. 6) and its abrupt change of style (i.e., i-x. 4 is poetical; x. 5-xviii is prosaic).

> So perfect are the parallels in thought and diction between these verses and Luke xvii.3, Matt.xviii.15, 35, that we must assume our Lord's acquaintance with them.[121]

These and many other parallels convinced Charles that "pre-Christian Judaism possessed a noble system of ethics on the subject of forgiveness."[122]

---

[118] The Testaments of the Twelve (1908), pp. lxxv-xcii. This material is briefly summarized in APOT 2: 291-292.

[119] Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve (1908), pp. xcii-xcv; APOT 2 (1913): 292-294.

[120] APOT 2 (1913): 292.

[121] Ibid., p. 293.

[122] Ibid.

Similarly, he wrote regarding the "duty of loving God and one's neighbor":

> It is remarkable that the famous command in the Gospels that embodies all duty in itself . . . is already found in the Testaments, though less emphatically and vigorously stated.[123]

A final, and perhaps the most significant, feature of Charles's work on this document was his efforts to isolate the Christian interpolations. As already pointed out, Charles believed the original writing to be Jewish, and he kept before his readers its basic Jewish characteristics. He believed the "overwhelming value" of the document lay in its ethical teaching, which bridged the gap between the ethics of the Old and New Testaments.[124] This ethical teaching, he maintained, belonged to the essence of the book; it formed its "warp and woof." He chided "a few English scholars" for taking every ethical idea common to both the Testaments of the XII and the New Testament as being Christian interpolations.[125] He maintained that three-fourths of the ethical passages have no direct parallels in the New Testament, even though they stand practically on the same level as those that do.[126] The only conclusion to be drawn from this evidence is to recognize these ethical teachings as belonging to the original Jewish text. Here is a methodological principle of considerable importance: one cannot separate Jewish and Christian materials solely on the basis of ethical ideas.

---

[123] Ibid. T. Iss. v.2, vii.6; T. Dan v.3=Mark 12:30, 31.

[124] Ibid., p. 282. See also his Religious Development (1914), p. 229.

[125] Ibid., p. 291. Although Charles cited no one by name, he perhaps had in mind Alfred Plummer, who--in critical opposition to Charles's thesis of the influence of the Testaments on the NT--had suggested "the converse hypothesis," and had assumed that the Gospels had influenced the Testaments. See Plummer, "The Relation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs to the Books of the New Testament," Exp, Series 7, 6 (1908): 481-490. Charles

We have also seen that Charles based his case primarily on textual evidence and obvious intrusions into otherwise smoothly flowing passages. He described these interpolations as

> patches differing alike in colour and texture from the original material, stitched on at times where originally there was no rent at all, and at others rudely thrust in where a rent had been deliberately made for their insertion.[127]

He argued that these additions "always import dogmatic Christian statements into a Jewish text, to which they are naturally alien in character."[128]

Charles's rigid adherence to these methodological principles is illustrated in an article written in 1911

---

answered Plummer in 1909: "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Relation to the New Testament," Exp, Series 7, 7 (1909): 111-118.

[126] APOT 2 (1913): 291.

[127] Ibid., note 1, p. 282.

[128] Ibid., p. 291.

where he summarized both the advance that was made in Schnapp's work of 1884 and the weaknesses in it.[129] Charles wrote that the Christian interpolations identified by Schnapp in his 1884 work on the basis of internal evidence, could have been confirmed by MS evidence in his translation of 1900, but were not. He maintained that Schnapp attributed too much to the interpolator whereas by using the available MS evidence, he could have made "much smaller and neater excisions."[130]

Charles was critical also of Schnapp's failure to recognize the literary structure of certain passages as poetical, where rhythm and parallelism are many times helpful in isolating intrusions. Charles cited Levi 18, Judah 25, Simeon 6, and Dan 5 as either wholly or in part Hebrew poetry, noting that Schnapp recognized only the first of these as such. Quoting T. Sim. 6:4-6, he pointed out that in verse 5 ("For the Lord our God shall appear on earth [as man].") the phrase "as man" destroys the parallelism and can thus be bracketed as an interpolation.[131]

Charles disagreed, too, with Schnapp's opinion that all the Christian passages were inserted into the text by one interpolator. Although there is "a fairly full Christology," the conflicting statements on the idea of Incarnation, Charles maintained, do not substantiate Schnapp's conclusion. Textual evidence also fails to uphold the idea of one interpolator, for the Christian additions are differently attested by the several Greek MSS, and each Greek MS (as well as the Armenian version and its several recensions), has Christian additions peculiar to itself.[132]

---

[129] Charles, "The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs," DB(H) 4 (1911): 721-725.

[130] Ibid., p. 722. Charles referred here to Schnapp's translation which appeared in APAT 2 (1900): 458-506.

[131] Ibid.

The following sampling of Charles's additions to the text cited in his 1908 Greek edition of the Testaments illustrates his method of textual analysis.[133] In these can be seen his emphasis on (1) purely Jewish ideas or theophanies transformed into a statement of Christian doctrine by the addition of a word or two, (2) the dogmatic character of certain additions making the Christian element obvious, (3) word order that sometimes betrays the hand of the interpolator, and (4) the use of Armenian MS evidence.

First, in T. Sim. vi.5 Charles bracketed the words "as man" and observed that "the passage without this addition describes simply a Theophany." These he noted were numerous in the Testaments: T. Lev. ii.11, v.2, viii. 11; T. Jud. xxii.2; T. Zeb.ix.9; T. Naph. viii.3; T. Ash. vii.3.[134] Again, T. Lev. iv.lh "And Hades taketh spoils through the visitations of the Most High," stands in a passage resounding in apocalyptic imagery of judgment akin to several O.T. passages, the "little apocalypse" of Mark 13, and much of the N.T. Book of Revelation. Charles pointed out that the Christian addition transformed this otherwise thoroughly Jewish account of the Judgment into "a description of the events accompanying the Crucifixion."[135] In his 1913 edition, his comments were more cautious. He noted a possible O.T. parallel to "Hades taketh spoils" in Isaiah 5:14: "Therefore Sheol has enlarged its appetite and opened its mouth beyond measure,. . ." If Christian, he suggested it could perhaps be read "and Hades is despoiled." Further, he indicated the problem with πάθει , translated here as "visitations," which he observed as "a difficult but possible rendering." If this is an interpolation, πάθει could easily be translated "passion."[136]

---

[132] Ibid., pp. 722-723.

[133] The Greek Versions of the Testaments, pp. xlviii-li; see also The Testaments of the Twelve (1908), pp. lxi-lxv. (A complete list of passages bracketed by Charles in his APOT 2 (1913) is cited in the introduction to this study.)

---

[134] The Greek Versions of the Testaments (1908), p. xlviii. See his critical note, APOT 2 (1913): 303, where he indicated also textual evidence for omitting the phrase and gave his "restored text." See the recent study by Jürgen Becker--Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Band 3. Unterweisung in lehrhafter Form (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1974.) The sections in Becker's text bracketed as Christian interpolations are almost identical to those listed by Charles.

[135] Charles, The Greek Versions of the Testaments, p. xlviii.

Similarly, in T. Lev. xiv.1, Charles argued that the addition of the words "against Him" (found in only one Greek text) makes a Christian passage out of a purely Jewish one.[137] The phrase reads: ". . . at the end of the ages ye will transgress against the Lord, stretching out hands to wickedness [against Him]; . . . "On the basis of other MSS, Charles set forth also this reading: ". . . in the end ye will transgress against the Lord, stretching out hands to all wickedness; . . ." In a textual note, he also suggested that it could be rendered: "stretching out hands against the Lord in all wickedness."[138] Again, according to Charles, T. Zeb. ix.8 "describes a Theophany in very startling words--'Ye shall see Him (i.e. God) in Jerusalem.'" He saw no problem here, since the phrase is found in Psalm 84:7 ("the God of gods will be seen in Zion.") and in T. Naph. viii.3. Certain Greek MSS, however, have the Christian addition ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου .[139]

A second consideration for Charles was the dogmatic character of certain passages. For example, in T. Sim. vi. 7c the entire clause "Because God hath taken a body and eaten with men and saved men" is bracketed. His comment was brief and pointed: "A manifest Christian interpolation."[140] The dogmatic character of the clause is clear, and Charles offered other evidence. He simply cited similar statements found in T. Dan v. 13d: "For the Lord shall be in the midst of it [living amongst men]. And the Holy One of Israel shall reign over it [in humility and in poverty; and he who believeth on Him shall reign amongst men in truth]"[141], and, T. Ash. vii.3: "Until the Most High shall visit the earth coming Himself [as man, with men eating and drinking], and breaking the head of the dragon in the water. He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles [God speaking in the person of man]."[142] Charles saw the T. Dan passage with its obvious incarnational emphasis as the kind of theophany found frequently in the Testaments (e.g., T. Sim. vi.5) which had been transformed into "a prophecy of Christ" by a dogmatic insertion.[143]

---

[136] *APOT* 2 (1913): 307.

[137] *The Greek Versions of the Testaments*, p. xlix.

[138] *APOT* 2 (1913): 312.

[139] *The Greek Versions of the Testaments*, p. xlix.

---

[140] The Greek Versions of the Testaments, p. xlviii.

[141] APOT 2 (1913): 335. Charles wrote that the second bracketed phrase too was a Christian addition, although he cited T. Jud. xxiv. 1 as similar in its comments on the Messiah's humility. (See his note on this passage, APOT, p. 323.)

[142] Ibid., p. 345. In his critical note, Charles described this passage as "a Theophany followed by the destruction of the primeval foe, the dragon." Ps. lxxiv.13 is cited as an O.T. example of such theophanies. The addition of the dogmatic Christian (incarnational) idea modifies drastically this common Jewish theophany.

T. Dan vi.9 reads: "And the things which ye have heard from your father, do ye also impart to your children [that the Saviour of the Gentiles may receive you; for he is true and long-suffering, meek and lowly, and teacheth by his works the law of God]." Charles maintained that in its present form this passage is undoubtedly Christian.[144] Although he bracketed the longer section, in his critical comments, he contended that the phrase "that the Saviour . . . receive you" was Christian, but noting a similar passage on the humility of the Messiah in T. Jud. xxiv.1, he conceded that this part of the statement may be Jewish.[145]

The following passages illustrate that word order, as well as MS evidence, was important in Charles's consideration of specific sentences and phrases. For example, T. Jos. xix.11: "Do ye therefore, my children, observe the commandments of the Lord, and honour Levi and Judah; for from them shall arise unto you [the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world] one who saveth [all the Gentiles and] Israel." Regarding this passage, Charles made two observations. First, when this reading (from the Greek MSS) is compared to the Armenian, the method of the interpolator becomes obvious. The Armenian reads, in part: "And do ye, my children, honour Levi and Judah, for from them shall arise the salvation of Israel." The insertion, which can be removed without disruption of continuity or meaning, is easily detected. Manuscript evidence gives additional support to the bracketing of this as an obvious Christian addition. His second observation stressed the mention of "all the Gentiles" before Israel, which he maintained "betrays the hand of the Christian interpolator."[146]

---

[143] The Greek Versions of the Testaments, p. xlix.

[144] Ibid.

[145] APOT 2 (1913): 335.

The same observations are offered for T. Benj. iii.8. In a comparison of the Greek MSS with the Armenian version, the Christian statements are obvious. The Greek texts read: "In thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven [concerning the Lamb of God, and Saviour of the world], and that a blameless one shall be delivered up for lawless men, and a sinless one shall die for ungodly men [in the blood of the covenant, for the salvation of the Gentiles and of Israel, and shall destroy Beliar and his servants.]" The Armenian: "In thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven, which says that the blameless one shall be defiled for lawless men, the sinless one shall die for ungodly men." Again, in the phrase "Gentiles . . . Israel," word order is seen as significant.[147] Similarly, Charles bracketed a phrase in T. Dan v.10 as a "clumsy" interpolation in which the Interpolator betrays his hand. The sentence reads: "And there shall arise unto you from the tribe of [Judah and of] Levi the salvation of the Lord; . . ." Charles maintained first that φυλῆς should have been changed to φυλῶν. The order also has changed here, for in the original Testaments, Levi is always mentioned before Judah. (See T. Sim. vii.1; T. Gad viii.1; T. Jos. xix.11.)[148]

---

[146] Ibid., p. 354. Also, The Greek Versions of the Testaments, p. 1.

The importance of the Armenian MS for Charles is especially evident in his work on the Testament of Benjamin. He maintained T. Benj. ix.3-5 is the only passage where the Armenian (A) has admitted Christian interpolations in T. Benjamin.[149] Regarding T. Benj. x.7, 8, 9 (Christian statements of the incarnation) Charles simply said that the Armenian text omitted the interpolations.[150] On T. Benj. xi,

> Here the interpolators have been hard at work. While one interpolator transformed the original, which spoke only of Benjamin, into a prophecy of Christ (c),

---

[147] Ibid., p. 356. Also, The Greek Versions of the Testaments, p. l.

[148] The Greek Versions of the Testaments, p. xlix.

[149] The Greek Versions of the Testaments, p. l. Cf. the Greek and Armenian texts of this passage, APOT 2 (1913): 358.

[150] APOT 2 (1913): 359.

> the other transformed it into a prophecy of St. Paul (β). The original text is preserved in A.[151]

To sum up, Charles's textual analysis depended on many factors. For the most, however, he was quite conservative in his approach to the text and built firm conclusions only on what could be supported with some degree of certainty. Most of his conclusions regarding Christian interpolations thus depended upon the obvious Christian character of such interpolations or genuine MS evidence. Scholars have not agreed with all of his methods or conclusions. None, however, has denied his attempts to be true to the text.

After R. H. Charles-- Challenges to a Position

In an article written in 1950 on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, E. J. Bickerman began with two observations which are typical of the scholarly reaction to the work of R. H. Charles. He first noted his disagreements with Charles on some points, and then stated that without Charles's work on the Testaments his own study would not have been possible.[152]

---

[151] The Greek Versions of the Testaments, pp. l-li. Cf. the readings in APOT 2 (1913): 360.

[152] E. J. Bickerman, "The Date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," JBL 69 (1950: 245-260.

In spite of the continuing debates on questions of method, textual evidence, date, authorship, and the like, Charles's position that the Testaments was an original Jewish work with Christian interpolations is axiomatic to almost every study of the Testaments from 1913 to 1950.

Not until the early 1950's did serious challengers arise. To detail these approaches to the Testaments would be going beyond the purpose of this present study, though brief mention is necessary to give due recognition to the on-going concern for the Testaments of the Twelve in pseudepigraphal research and to alert the reader to other possible literary and cultural contexts which may be considered in approaching this document.

M. de Jonge and the question of Christian origin

In his major study of the Testaments, de Jonge set out to examine the interpolation theory as set forth by R. H. Charles and others.[153] Since the exhortatory passages form the main part of the Testaments, along with the haggadic material and (to a lesser degree) the apocalyptic passages, de Jonge saw in the document, "a religious-ethical teaching closely related to that of the New Testament concerning these matters."[154] Thus, the problems of authorship and date were extremely important for him. The following statements from his general introduction indicate his concerns regarding the text of the Testaments. Viewing the nature of the composition from two possible perspectives, each with its own peculiar problems, he observed first:

---

[153] Marianus de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin (Assen, Netherlands: Koninelijde Van Gorcum & Comp., N.V., (1953), p. 12.

[154] Ibid., p. 9.

> If the book can be shown to be a product of pre-Christian Judaism, we have here a 'praeparatio evangelica' or a kind of 'pre-Christian Christianity.' It might even be supposed that Jesus Christ and His first followers stood in a direct line of succession to the group which produced the Testaments.[155]

Secondly,

> If, on the other hand, one can prove that the Testaments are of Christian origin, their similarities may be traced to direct dependence upon the New Testament. In that case the interesting problem arises: how could a Christian incorporate so much Jewish haggadic material in his book?[156]

Since a number of Christian phrases and passages are found in contexts not specifically Christian, de Jonge concluded:

> It must be asked whether these may be removed as interpolations so that a completely Jewish original remains, or whether this and other Christian material is so interwoven with the very texture of the work, that it forms an integral part of the Testaments.[157]

De Jonge's method was two-fold. First, he gave a detailed analysis of the available textual evidence, with special attention to the passages bracketed by Bousset and Charles as Christian interpolations, in order to place the textual variants of the Armenian version in their proper perspective.[158] He then analyzed the composition of the Testaments along form-critical lines. He wrote that,

---

[155] Ibid. [156] Ibid. [157] Ibid.

> sudden changes in thought, differences between a passage and its context, unusual grammatical constructions, agreements in structure and subject-matter between passages, and the like can help us to explain how the present text of the Testaments came into being.[159]

De Jonge reached two significant conclusions. First, regarding textual evidence he concluded that the Armenian MS was of little value in isolating Christian additions to the Greek text.[160] He maintained that (1) "A's readings are nearly always secondary,"[161] and (2) "with its many omissions A does not usually represent the original text."[162] Since in the later Testaments A's text is much shorter than that of the Greek he doubted whether A "has preserved the original, not interpolated text in a few places where the Greek has suffered from Christian interpolations."[163]

---

[158] Ibid., pp. 13-36. [159] Ibid., p. 38.

[160] Ibid., p. 34. [161] Ibid., p. 31. [162] Ibid., p. 28.

[163] Ibid., p. 27. It should be remembered that Charles himself admitted that A was guilty of omissions on almost every page and was often so corrupt that the meaning had to be guessed at, The Greek Versions of the Twelve (1908), p. xvi.

Second, de Jonge concluded that the author of the Testaments was a Christian, "a compilator, not an interpolator."[164] After careful analysis of the composition of the text, he postulated the existence of a Jewish Testament of Levi ("original Levi"), the source used by the author of our Greek Testament of Levi. He maintained that the author used the source "very freely and added many parts from other sources and remarks of his own, and wrote a new Christian Testament.[165] Consequently, he felt it was incorrect to speak of Christian interpolations in an original document. Rather, our present Testament of Levi is a Christian writing in which many Jewish elements have been used.[166]

Similarly, after comparing the Testament of Naphtali of the present Testaments text with the Hebrew Testament of Naphtali brought to light by M. Gaster in 1894,[167] de Jonge concluded that the Christian author of the Testaments "omitted or changed all passages which could throw an unfavourable light on the person of Joseph."[168] Further, since the Jewish Testament of Levi ("original

---

[164] Ibid., p. 42. [165] Ibid., pp. 38-52.

[166] Ibid., p. 52.

[167] Ibid., pp. 52-60. Gaster, "The Hebrew Text of one of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," translated in Charles, Testaments of the Twelve (1908), 221-227.

[168] Ibid., p. 57.

Levi") and the Hebrew Testament of Naphtali are so dissimilar, he expressed his doubt that they ever belonged to one document. Thus, "our Christian author seems to have been the first to bring a Test. of Levi and a Test. of Naphtali and other relevant material together in order to write Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs."[169] In this way, de Jonge examined each major section of the Testaments, seeking to reinforce his conclusion.

In 1957, 1960 and 1962 de Jonge produced three briefer studies in which he reiterated his position and attempted to answer his critics.[170] Some changes--although slight--are present in these studies. In a review of de Jonge's work, D. R. Jones had argued for a Jewish stage in the composition of the Testaments, since the Levi-Judah-pattern[171] appears in various places where there is no hint of Christian alteration.[172] Answering this question, de Jonge again stated his hypothesis that the Christian author had used various Jewish original materials in his work.[173] Admitting that his earlier study had not given proper emphasis to the part played by oral tradition in Judaism and Christianity of the first two centuries A.D., he wrote:

---

[169] Ibid.

[170] M. de Jonge, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament," papers presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957," published in Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 73 (1959): 546-556; "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," NT 4 (1960): 182-235; "Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," NT 5 (1962): 311-319.

[171] De Jonge had presented two distinct patterns which recur repeatedly in the Testaments: the S.E.R.-pattern which dealt with the future sins, exile and punishment, and return of the people; and the L.J.-pattern which glorifies Levi and Judah. De Jonge believed both sections were composed by the Christian author of the Testaments. See de Jonge, Testaments, pp. 83-89.

> It is quite conceivable that the Christian author (s) was (were) only the last of a series of collectors and redactors of Testament material, which was transmitted in writing as well as orally, gradually grew in size during the ages and was adapted to various needs.[174]

Another reviewer, H. F. D. Sparks, argued that "the composition-theory" does not differ as radically from "the interpolation theory" as de Jonge claimed. Sparks asked the significant question:

> Do not both theories issue ultimately in a view of the Testaments which regards them as an amalgam of both Jewish and Christian elements whose frontiers we are unable exactly to define?[175]

---

[172] D. R. Jones, Review of M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Theology 57 (1954): 390-392.

[173] "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament," p. 550.

[174] Ibid. Cf. J. W. Doeve, Review of M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, NedThT 9 (1954): 49-52.

[175] H. F. D. Sparks, Review of M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, JThS, n.s., 6 (1955): 289.

In spite of his critics and the troublesome questions they asked, de Jonge held to his conclusion of 1953. He acknowledged the validity of their critical remarks but maintained that these do not "invalidate the conclusion that the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, as we have them, are a Christian composition."[176]

Several concluding observations are now possible regarding de Jonge's position. First, he conceded that the author used Jewish traditions; yet he wondered how the author became acquainted with such material.[177] The late date which he assigned to the document, raised this question, but an earlier date, as assigned in the interpretation of Charles and others, poses no such problem. Instead, it appeals to an earlier milieu common to both Jews and Christians, in which there seems to be no justification for attempting to distinguish sharply Jewish and Christian materials.

De Jonge admitted that some passages of the Testaments were not obviously Christian and that in others the Christian alterations were slight. Nevertheless, he maintained that "we can never be sure that the not clearly Christian expressions or passages were written by a Jewish author, and many times it is impossible to decide whether a particular passage is Jewish or Christian.[178] This admission seriously weakens his analysis of the Testaments. He would perhaps say that this indecisiveness simply results from the skill of the redactor. But the reverse could be true--viz., the document is a Jewish writing containing some obvious Christian additions.

---

[176] De Jonge, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament," p. 550.

[177] See de Jonge, The Testaments, pp. 117-118.

In the second place, de Jonge insisted that the Testaments "as we have them" are a Christian composition. This somehow misses the point of the discussion of the nature of the document. The defenders of the interpolation theory would agree whole heartedly, but to say, that the Testaments "as we have them" are Christian is not yet to demonstrate a Christian origin for them. In spite of his refusal to deviate from his major conclusion of 1953, de Jonge did retreat slightly in admitting that the final Christian composition could conceivably be the work of one who stands last in a series of collectors and redactors of Testament material. All of this debate illustrates the importance and problematic of terminology. Can a hard and fast line be drawn between a Jewish document that has been interpolated by a Christian, and a Christian document whose author utilized Jewish materials? Can a writing be labeled a redacted rather than an interpolated document merely because the uninterpolated original cannot be found? These questions remain open.

---

[178] De Jonge, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament," pp. 554-555.

Third, de Jonge assigned a date between c. 190 A.D. and c. 224 A.D. to the writing of the Testaments, primarily because he claimed that "they contain notions which seem to be generally accepted in the time of Irenaeus, Hippolytus and Tertullian, and are not found earlier. . ."[179] He conceded that such parallels between the Testaments and the early Christian Fathers "are not conclusive, since they do not necessarily point to interdependence."[180] But if no interdependence is shown, it would be just as logical to conclude that these ideas which appeared later in the Christian Fathers appeared at an earlier time in the Testaments.

In this connection another of de Jonge's comments is significant. At the beginning of his major study he stated his agreement with N. Messel's argument that to remove the obvious Christian interpolations from the Testaments leaves as remainder a kind of Judaism witnessed to only in the Testaments themselves, which stresses universalism, love for one's neighbor, and the like.[181] But such a phenomenon de Jonge argued, belongs rather to Christianity. This argument, however, is inconclusive. For one thing, George Foot Moore acknowledged that the Testaments contained many Christian passages but maintained that "the bulk of the book is prima facie Jewish, the morals no less than the legends."[182] Further, R. Travers Herford contended that the Testaments is pervaded by "the broad humane spirit."

---

[179] De Jonge, The Testaments, p. 125. He discussed (pp. 121-125) such ideas as the connection between Satan and the tribe of Dan (T. Dan v.6), the interpretation of Gen. 49:27 as a prophecy concerning the Benjaminite Paul (T. Benj. xi.1), and Joseph as a type of Christ (e.g., T. Sim. iv.3).

[180] Ibid., p. 124.

> If all men are made in the image of God, they are spiritually akin to each other, and for that reason virtue includes brotherly love, kindness, sympathy, pity and forgiveness.[183]

Herford described the document as "an isolated witness to a nobility in the Judaism of its time."[184] There are, to be sure, Christian interpolations, but that the whole book is by a Christian "is out of the question." He concluded that the author was

> a Jew of very remarkable gifts, who wrote long before Jesus words which it has been thought could only be

---

[181] Ibid., pp. 10-11. See N. Messel, "Über die textkritisch begrundete Ausscheidung vermutlicher christlicher Interpolationen in den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen," BZAW 33 (1918): 356.

[182] George Foot Moore, Judaism, 1:192.

[183] Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha, p. 237.

[184] Ibid., p. 242.

> Christian, but which only show how much there was, in the Judaism of that time, of spiritual discernment and ethical nobility.[185]

Finally, in a recent study, Walter Harrelson has explained the uniqueness of the Testaments in another way.[186] The Testaments came at a time when "the structures of the Jewish community were . . . gravely imperiled by the political, cultural and economic developments of the period. . ."[187] During these trying times when life became almost impossible for the Jew, "the message of apocalyptic ethics necessarily tended more and more to be addressed to the individual."[188] Harrelson maintains that the Testaments is the best intertestamental example of "this emphasis upon individual conduct."[189] The author speaks to the individual "but within a communal or family setting."[190] Thus, Harrelson interprets the Testaments in terms of a time when Jewish theology and ethics were threatened and historical realities had dealt a blow to the community in which God's Torah had been experienced. The message had to be proclaimed in such a way as to call for individual responses, but the dangers of individualization were nonetheless to be combatted.

---

[185] Ibid., p. 239.

[186] Walter Harrelson, "The Significance of 'Last Words' for Intertestamental Ethics," in Essays in Old Testament Ethics, ed. James L. Crenshaw and John T. Willis (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974), pp. 203-213.

[187] Ibid., p. 209. [188] Ibid., p. 210. [189] Ibid.

[190] Ibid., p. 211.

Harrelson stresses the importance of

> the author's use of the device of having the descendants gather around the dying patriarch and hear his counsel to the entire living family. His ethical admonitions were addressed to the individual family members, calling for individual responses. He spoke not to the whole of his family, his tribe. His counsel thus had the effect upon readers, we may believe, of filling the gap between a prophetic or priestly ethic addressed to all Israel God's people, on the one hand, and the individual Israelite on the other.[191]

When such a background to the Testaments is stressed, to say that it stands as an isolated witness to a kind of Judaism not witnessed to elsewhere would not be surprising. Thus, de Jonge's argument on this point may be challenged since apocalyptic literature has to be described in terms of its historical circumstances; the times may indeed call for emphatic proclamation of ideas which may have been previously without need of emphasis.

De Jonge had accused Bousset and Charles of going "beyond the scope of the available evidence" in their efforts to prove their interpolations theory.[192] Perhaps de Jonge may be guilty of the same error.

---

[191] Ibid., pp. 210-211.

[192] M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 31.

De Jonge gave no consideration to the Qumran materials in his study of 1953. In 1957 he acknowledged that the study of the background and composition of the Testaments must take into account the parallels between them and the Qumran documents in order to identify pre-Christian elements in the Testaments.[193] That such parallels indicated literary or historical dependence one way or another seemed improbable, and that the Testaments could be used as evidence for the beliefs of the Qumran sect was out of the question for de Jonge.[194]

Several scholars however, did suggest theories of Qumran origins for the Testaments, among them A. Dupont-Sommer and Marc Philonenko. For the purposes of this study their views will be taken as representative of this position.

The Testaments and Qumran

A. Dupont-Sommer published his observations on the Qumran materials in 1953, the same year de Jonge set forth his arguments for Christian origins.[195] Although at the time nothing of the Testaments had been found at Qumran, Dupont-Sommer was confident that fragments of them would be.[196]

---

[193] De Jonge, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament," p. 551.

[194] Ibid., pp. 553-556.

[195] A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, trans. from the French by R. D. Barnett (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., Ltd., 1954). The French appeared in 1953 entitled: Nouveaux Aperçus sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte.

Dupont-Sommer was convinced that the Testaments speak of the Teacher of Righteousness as a priestly Messiah. He developed this theory by carefully comparing the T. Levi with references from Qumran materials, focusing primarily on two chapters (chs. 17 and 18) which he saw as closely interconnected.[197] He wrote that they present on the one side (ch. 17),

> in a prophetic and sibylline style, the story of a 'priesthood' consisting of all of seven priests who, after beginning in the most saintly and glorious manner became more and more degraded until they culminated in an abominable crime, which was visited by a divine punishment of exceptional gravity. On the other side (Chapter XVIII), after the disappearance of this fallen priesthood, the book celebrates in messianic terms the arrival of a 'new Priest' whose everlasting priesthood will mark the definitive triumph of Good.[198]

After testing this theory by examining passages from T. Levi in the light of similar ideas in the Damascus Document and the Habakkuk Commentary, he concluded that the author had in mind the Hasmonaean dynasty which began so well with Judas Maccabaeus and ended so wretchedly with John Hyrcanus

---

[196] Ibid., p. 38. The citations are from the ET.

[197] Ibid. He devotes an entire chapter to this idea: "The Testament of Levi and the Teacher of Righteousness," pp. 38-57.

[198] Ibid., p. 39.

XUM

and Aristobulus I.[199] He further concluded that

> this new Priest, *to whom all the words of the Lord shall be revealed*, is the Teacher of Righteousness himself, who we know from the *Habakkuk Commentary* was a priest (ii,8) and whom *God made to know all the mysteries of the words of His servant, the prophets* (vii,4-5).[200]

Regarding Dupont-Sommer's work, de Jonge acknowledged the usefulness of recognizing parallels between the Qumran documents and the Testaments but remained firm in his conclusion of 1953. He argued that Dupont-Sommer based his conclusions on "a very obscure chapter" (which de Jonge himself felt was an abbreviated form of an originally larger apocalypse), and that the context clearly showed the references to be to Christ.[201]

Marc Philonenko, in 1960 supported Dupont-Sommer's thesis in a more detailed examination of specific passages from the Testaments. His purpose was the same as Dupont-Sommer's--to show that the messianic passages in the Testaments refer to the Qumran Teacher.[202]

---

[199] Ibid., pp. 42-57. [200] Ibid., p. 51.

[201] De Jonge, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the NT," pp. 553-554, note 4. See also, A. J. B. Higgins, "The Priestly Messiah," *NTS* 13 (1966-1967): 211-239, who saw the Testaments as a Christian writing with earlier Jewish ideas and noted that the differences between them and Qumran (especially on messianic ideas) preclude any close relationship (pp. 229-231).

[202] Marc Philonenko, *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qoumrân* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960).

He assumed a relationship between the Testaments and the Qumran manuscripts confirmed in his opinion by the discovery of several Aramaic fragments of a T. Levi and a Hebrew fragment of a T. Naphtali.[203] He agreed with Schnapp, Bousset, and Charles that the Testaments contained Jewish interpolations; he listed these and agreed with de Jonge that their common characteristic was the theme of Sin-Exile-Return.[204] Noting the relationship between the Testaments and the Psalms of Solomon he placed this Jewish redaction after 63 B.C., maintaining that this date is confirmed by the clear allusion in T. Zeb. 9:5 to Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II. An allusion in T. Judah 22:2 to Herod the Great suggested an even later date after 37 B.C.[205]

Philonenko identified several other themes which he believed came from the same Jewish redactor: the exaltation of Levi and Judah, the resurrection, and

---

The book appeared originally as an article under the same title, RHPhR 38 (1958): 309-343; 39 (1959): 14-38. The pages cited are from the book. Philonenko was critical of de Jonge's neglect of the Qumran materials, p. 3.

[203] Ibid. Philonenko believed these were the sources behind our T. Levi and T. Naphtali.

[204] Ibid., pp. 5-6. See de Jonge, Testaments, pp. 83-89, who defined this S.E.R.-pattern which dealt with sins, exile and punishment, and return of the people. De Jonge felt that these passages were from the Christian author; Philonenko saw them as Jewish redactions.

[205] Ibid., p. 6.

universalism.[206] Since the "christological interpolations" appear in these Jewish additions and not in the original document, Philonenko concluded that they are probably of Qumran origin.[207]

Philonenko analyzed passages generally identified as Christian and concluded, in every case, that the Teacher of Qumran is the focus of the messianic references. When the Testaments are seen in proper relation to the Qumran documents, the history and theology of the Qumran community can be more clearly established.[208]

Still maintaining his thesis of Christian origin for the Testaments, de Jonge responded to Philonenko with four major arguments. First, one cannot deduce, as Philonenko did, a common origin for documents merely from similarity of ideas. Second, Philonenko had taken the passages which he regards as interpolated out of context. In addition, there are other passages, not considered by Philonenko, in which Christian influence can be recognized. Finally, Philonenko has not moved logically in his arguments. Even though he admitted that the Christology of the Testaments is not identical with the messianic ideas of the Qumran sect, he still argued on the basis of these christological ideas that the Testaments were of Qumran origin.[209]

---

[206] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[207] Ibid., p. 7.

[208] See especially his conclusions, ibid., pp. 59-60.

In the works of Dupont-Sommer, Philonenko and others who argued a Qumran origin for the Testaments, the common fallacy is illustrated--viz., the tendency to read a document for what one believes it to be. The common ideas, the discovery of fragments of T. Levi and T. Naphtali, and the like, produced the assumption that this writing must belong to the Qumran sect. Once accepted, evidences of it were seen on every page. The constant re-examination of accepted ideas is the task of scholarship. The Testaments is not indisputably a pre-Christian Jewish writing which was later interpolated by Christians merely because R. H. Charles has said it is. However, to abandon the position without clear evidence of its error is as futile as staying with it when the evidence shows clearly its weaknesses.

Perhaps Rost is correct in pointing out that since the Testaments itself had not been found at Qumran, Philonenko was open to challenge in putting it there.[210]

---

[209] De Jonge, "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," NT 4 (1960): 188-189.

[210] L. Rost, "Testamente der XII Patriarchen," RGG^3 6 (1962): col. 702.

Conclusions

From Grabe's suggestion of Jewish origin for the Testaments to de Jonge's efforts to show Christian origin, every position has recognized both Christian and non-Christian elements in the text. On this there is agreement. The disagreement consists in the conclusions drawn from this evidence: the document, originally Jewish, has received later Christian interpolations; or the Testaments is a Christian composition based on existing Jewish materials.

Every method of handling the text has yielded the same inconclusiveness. The presence of Christian materials within a document does not prove that it is an originally Christian writing; yet de Jonge correctly insists that a Christian could use Jewish traditions in the writing of a Christian work.[211] If sutures exist, they can be explained on either assumption, for in both cases a single writer brings together separate sources into a single composition.

Source criticism has not been too helpful on the question of origin. Even after Jewish and Christian sources are identified the question remains: Is the basic document an original Jewish or original Christian one?

This survey has shown too that textual studies, especially with regard to the usefulness of the Armenian version, need a close re-examination. The need for such external textual evidence is indisputable; without this kind of evidence literary criticism will always suffer from the weakness of seeking to prove its own assumptions. This error has been mentioned several times as a tendency to read a document for what one already believes it to be.

---

[211] De Jonge, "Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," NT 5 (1962): 317.

Regarding the question of origin, scholarship is still faced with the choice between two opposing solutions. In one, the document is seen as an integrated whole, having both Christian and Jewish materials, but standing in its present form as a unified Christian composition. On the other hand, a recognition of sutures, breaks in continuity, and the like, between the Jewish and Christian elements leads to the conclusion that the Testaments is indeed Christian, but has only become so secondarily through a process of interpolation.

Finally, with regard to Qumran and the Testaments words of caution are needed. For one thing, scholars still know very little about Qumran. What is known, however, reveals that the unique phenomenon of Qumran can neither be explained merely in terms of geographical isolation from Judaism proper nor in terms of the literature it may or may not have possessed. As to the Testaments, scholarship has shown it to be a document which is indeed prima facie Jewish. Whether or not this writing is found at Qumran cannot change that fact. Thus, scholars must continue to investigate the questions regarding the possible relationships between the Qumran materials and the Testaments, but the dogmatic evidence which some already claim to have discovered must, for the present, be seen as inconclusive.

CHAPTER IV

SEVEN OTHER APOCALYPTIC WRITINGS

In addition to the three documents treated extensively in the first three chapters of this dissertation, there are seven others which scholars generally describe as originally Jewish with later Christian additions. These are: the Life af Adam and Eve (=The Apocalypse of Moses), the Apocalypse of Abraham, the Testament of Abraham, III Baruch (=Greek Apocalypse of Baruch), II Enoch (=Slavonic Book of Enoch; the Book of the Secrets of Enoch), IV Ezra (=II Esdras; the Apocalypse of Ezra), and the Sibylline Oracles.[1] These are treated briefly in this chapter.

The Life of Adam and Eve

Scholars agree that there arose prior to the beginning of the Christian era a cycle of legendary materials about Adam and Eve.[2] Moses Buttenwieser wrote that of all the characters of the Bible used to present religious and ethical truths none received as much attention as Adam.

---

[1] For a brief introduction to these writings, see D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, pp. 54-66.

[2] See, F. J. A. Hort, "Adam, Books of," DCB 1(1877): 34-39; Schürer, History of the Jewish People 3: 146-148; Ginzberg, "Adam, Books of," JE 1(1901): 179-180; Denis, Pseudépigraphes Grecs, pp. 3-14.

He maintained too that "both Jews and Christians contributed to the task of 'improving and embellishing' the narrative in Genesis, using it as a convenient vehicle for the presentation of their own beliefs and ideas."[3]

The narrative is a simple one relating the sorrow of Adam and Eve after their sin and departure from paradise, their act of penance (standing in the Jordan River for forty days), the birth of their sons, the vision of Adam (in which is found the small but significant apocalyptic element, 29:4-10),[4] the retelling by Eve of the story of the fall, and finally the death and burial of Adam and then Eve.

A casual reading of this text indicates little that is obtrusively Christian. Emil Schürer maintained that Christians had elaborated these Jewish legends so zealously that it is "impossible to distinguish with any certainty between what is Jewish and what is Christian."[5] The following passages are generally described as Christian modifications or interpolations. First, in 6:2 when Adam proposes that they do penance by standing up to their necks in water, Eve in the Tigris and he in the Jordan, the mention of the Jordan seems out of place. Wells noted that this was probably changed by the "Christian editor" from 'Gihon' where the Jews placed Adam's penitence.[6] Ginzberg also cited this as the work of "Christian copyists, who, for obvious reasons, wished to represent Adam as having had his baptism in the Jordan."[7]

---

[3] Moses Buttenwieser, "Adam, Books of," UJE 1(1939): 78-79.

[4] So, Russell, Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, p. 60.

[5] Schürer, History of the Jewish People 3: 147.

Second, several phrases and sentences are bracketed in ch. 29. In 29:2, the words "and sacraments" are described as a gloss, apparently because it sounds "Christian" and can be omitted without disruption of the text.[8] Verse 7b reads: "And therefore God will dwell with men on earth [in visible form]; . . ." Wells contended that this phrase was certainly of Christian origin. In the same note, however, R. H. Charles, as general editor, called attention to Psalm 84:7 (LXX, Vulgate) and T. Zeb. 9:8 "where God is spoken of as being seen by men," and cautioned that there was no good reason for seeing 29:3-20 as Christian (as Wells suggested) "with the exception of a few words."[9]

The only obviously dogmatic passage is 42:25.

> When five thousand and five hundred years have been fulfilled, then will come upon earth the

---

[6] APOT 2:135, note on 6:2.

[7] Ginzberg, JE 1(1901): 180. [8] APOT 2: 140.

[9] Ibid., note on 29:7. Charles did not elaborate on his suggestion that "a few words" could be seen as Christian. Apparently he was simply giving to Wells the benefit of doubt. Otherwise, the statement only suggests a very careless procedure in textual analysis.

> most beloved king Christ, the son of God, to revive the body of Adam and with him to revive the bodies of the dead. He Himself, the Son of God, when He comes will be baptized in the river Jordan, and when He hath come out of the water of Jordan, then He will anoint from the oil of mercy all that believe in Him. And the oil of mercy shall be for generation to generation for those who are ready to be born again of water and the Holy Spirit to life eternal. Then the most beloved Son of God, Christ, descending on earth shall lead thy father Adam to Paradise to the tree of mercy.[10]

Although this passage is obviously Christian, the redactor has worked it into the general scheme of the narrative. Adam is sick and about to die and Seth goes looking for "the oil of mercy" for his healing. The narrative is permeated with the idea that death comes now, but afterward judgment and then resurrection when sorrow shall be "converted into joy." Until then, the angel Michael will be in charge of Adam's body (chs. 42-48).

In the Apocalypse of Moses,[11] 41:3 reads: "Again I promise to thee the Resurrection; I will raise thee up in the Resurrection with every man, who is of thy seed." Wells noted a variant reading ("every race of man") which he suggested was perhaps Christian.[12] Again, in 43:2, another reference to "the day of the

---

[10] Ibid., p. 144. The whole passage is found in the Gospel of Nicodemus 19 (the Greek work). See M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament(Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924), pp. 127-128; also, NTA 1:472.

[11] Torrey, Apocryphal Literature, p. 31, described this as an "unsuitable title" given to the Greek text in 1866 by its first editor, Tischendorf.

[12] APOT 2: 152.

Resurrection," the Armenian adds "and Advent," which Wells labeled as a Christian gloss.[13] He noted further that the doxologies (there are three variations, Greek, Armenian, and Slavonic) of 43:5 were later Christian additions.[14] He did not elaborate and offered no evidence for this assumption. The Greek MS is C, which Wells followed throughout (along with Greek MS D) unless obviously unsatisfactory. The Armenian and Slavonic can be safely described as variations. He gave no reason, however, for his refusal to accept C as original at this point. Nothing specifically Christian appears in these passages.

To sum up: there is no reason to doubt a Jewish origin for this document. A first century A.D. date is shown both by the haggadic material, which resembles closely that found in Jubilees and the Testaments of the XII, and the fact that nothing of the 70 A.D. catastrophe is found in the "little apocalypse" in 29:4-10.[15] B. J. Bamberger added that the "rather developed concept of Satan" fits a date near the beginning of the Christian era.[16]

The religious ideas are of the simplest character: repentance, a future resurrection, and the strife between good and evil.[17] All of these are of the woof and warp of Jewish thought, and there is no reason to see them in any other way. Other than those obvious glosses and interpolations (e.g., 6:2 and 42:2-5) the document is Jewish through and through.[18] Thus, when C. C. Torrey declared that the Christian insertions are generally "recognized without difficulty," his procedure of textual analysis appears valid.[19] What is Christian is obvious from its dogmatic character; what is not obviously Christian is thus Jewish, and the interpreter is in error in reading into it Christian notions.

---

[13] Ibid., p. 153. [14] Ibid., p. 154.

[15] So, Torrey, Apocryphal Literature, p. 133. This date is questioned by Wells, APOT 2:140, who saw in 29:6 a possible reference to the Temple of the messianic age.

[16] B. J. Bamberger, "Adam, Books of," IDB 1(1962): 45.

The Apocalypse of Abraham

The Apocalypse of Abraham is a work which has been preserved only in a Slavonic version, based on a Greek translation of an original Hebrew or Aramaic writing.[20] The work is generally assigned a late first century A.D.

---

[17] Buttenwieser, UJE 1(1939): 79.

[18] Cf. Ginzberg, JE 1(1901): 180, who maintained that Christological notions are absent even in those passages where we would expect them from a Christian editor or compilor. He concluded that "neither the Apoc. Mosis nor the Vita was in any way tampered with by Christian writers."

[19] Torrey, Apocryphal Literature, p. 32.

[20] There appears to be no debate on this point. See G. H. Box, The Apocalypse of Abraham(London: Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge, 1919), p. vii; Ginzberg, JE 1(1901): 91; George J. Reid, CathEnc 1(1907): 604; Buttenwieser, UJE 1(1934): 38; Arie Rubinstein, "Hebraisms in the (Slavonic) 'Apocalypse of Abraham,'" JJS 5(1954): 132-135. Rubinstein gives evidence for a Hebrew original.

date, since it refers to the destruction of the Temple (ch. 21ff.).[21] Ginzberg added two further observations. First, the Abraham legend found in chs. 1-8 is not as developed as that found in the Book of Jubilees. Ginzberg believed that Jubilees was written after 70 and thus maintained that this part of the Apocalypse had to be dated before the middle of the first century. Second, the emphasis given in the Apocalypse proper to the freedom of man, he believed, presupposed a knowledge of the Christian doctrine of sin, against which the entire section is directed. He concluded that "this very opposition to the Christian dogmas shows that at the time the Apocalypse was written Christianity was not far removed from Judaism." He thus assigned a late first century date to the Apocalypse (chs. 9-33); the interpolations (he suggested that both Christian and Gnostic ideas had been interpolated) came later.[22]

The work falls into two distinct parts. The first part (chs. 1-8) consists of a midrashic narrative based upon the legend of Abraham's conversion from idolatry to monotheism.[23] The second part (chs. 9ff.) begins as a midrash on Genesis 15 and contains the apocalyptic vision of Abraham. Escorted by the angel Jaoel, Abraham flies to heaven, and from there he sees events of the past (the temptation of Adam and Eve, the murder of Abel, and the like, chs. 22-25) and of the future (the destruction of the Temple and the coming messianic age, chs. 26-32). In its present form, the two parts of the work are organically connected. In ch. 10, the archangel alludes to the narratvie of ch. 8 regarding the death of Terah because of his idol worship; a similar reference is found also in ch. 26. Box argued that the general plan of the whole work is based on Abraham's dissatisfaction with idol worship which led finally to Terah's death and to his instruction in the knowledge of heavenly secrets.[24] Thus, even though the two parts of the document were apparently written at different times, the redactor skillfully combined the two into one unified composition.[25]

---

[21] See S. G. F. Brandon, DCR(1970), pp. 22-23, and EJR(1966), p. 4, where a 2nd century C.E. date is suggested. Reid, CathEnc 1(1907): 604, maintained that the data are so vague it is impossible to fix a date for the document.

[22] Ginzberg, JE 1(1901): 91-92. See J. B. Frey, DBSup 1(1928); cols. 30-31, who also emphasized the simple and more primitive form of the Abraham legend when compared to later rabbinical writings.

Box contended that the book was essentially Jewish with features which suggested Essene origin--its strong predestinarian doctrine, its dualism, and its ascetic emphases. He suggested that it passed from Essene to Ebionite circles, and, in some form, found its way into Gnostic circles.[26] According to him, the Christian element is confined to a short interpolated passage in ch. 29.[27] This passage reads, in part, as follows.

---

[23] Because this section is so different from the apocalyptic section, Ginzberg suggested that it could just as appropriately be called "The Legend of Abraham," ibid.

[24] Box, The Apocalypse of Abraham, pp. vii-viii.

[25] J. B. Frey, DBSup 1(1928): col. 32, speculated that the writer of the second part probably had before him the first part.

> And I [looked and] saw a man going out from the left side of the heathen; and there went out men and women and children, from the side of the heathen, many hosts, and worshipped him. And while I still looked there came out from the right side (many), and some insulted that man, while some struck him; others, however, worshipped him. [And] I saw how these worshipped him, and Azazel ran and worshipped him, and having kissed his face he turned and stood behind him.
>
> And I said: "O Eternal, mighty one! Who is the man insulted and beaten, who is worshipped by the heathen with Azazel?"
>
> And He answered and said: "Hear, Abraham! The man whom thou sawest insulted and beaten and again worshipped--that is the relief (granted) by the heathen to the people who proceed from thee, in the last days, in this twelfth hour of the age of ungodliness. . . . I will set up this man from thy generation, who thou sawest (issue) from my people; . . . and those whom thou sawest emerge from the left side of the picture--the meaning is: There shall be many from the heathen who set their hopes upon him; and as for those whom thou sawest from thy seed on the right side, some insulting and striking, others worshipping him--many of them shall be offended at him. . . .[28]

---

[26] Box, The Apocalypse of Abraham, pp. xxi-xxiv.

[27] Ibid., p. xxxi.

[28] Ibid., pp. 78-79. This is Box's translation of the text.

Without elaboration Box described the passage as a Christian interpolation, probably a Jewish-Christian one.[29] Even to the casual reader, the passage has several outstanding features. First, the "man" is apparently to be interpreted as an individual. Second, he is identified as coming from Abraham's generation (i.e., his descendant) and from the people of God. Third, he is to be followed by both the heathen (those from the left) and the Jews (those from the right). Fourth, his sufferings at their hands are reminiscent of Isaiah 53. It could perhaps be asked whether one would find anything specifically Christian here (any more than in Isaiah 53) if he were not looking for it. Box stressed "the worship of Christ by the Devil (Azazel)" as a striking feature in this passage but noted the difficulty in its interpretation. He suggested that it could hardly mean that Azazel had been truly converted since he offers only "lip-homage" akin to that of Judas. Citing New Testament passages (Luke 10:18; Phil. 2:9; Col. 2:15; Eph. 1:21f.) he concluded that the real meaning perhaps is that "the kingdom of evil, and the Satanic powers, have been vanquished by Christ. . . . The homage of Azazel--the head of the unredeemed heathen world--marked the triumph of Christ."[30]

---

[29] Ibid., p. 78, note 1.

[30] Ibid.

There is apparently no textual evidence for supposing ch. 29 to be Christian. The reason is dogmatic, and even that is quite indirect.

The Testament of Abraham

Despite its title, "The Testament of Abraham" does not fit the literary category of "testaments."[31] It contains no "last words," but rather consists of a narrative describing Abraham's reluctance to accept death until he is able to see all things in heaven and on earth.[32] Some scholars question its being labeled an apocalyptic work, since it has no impending crisis and stresses throughout an individual eschatology.[33]

M. R. James in 1892 argued that the Testament was originally put together in the second century by a Christian--"a Jewish Christian, there can be little doubt, but still a Christian"--who used existing Jewish legends for the narrative sections and drew largely on his imagination for the apocalyptic.[34] The two extant recensions probably came, James suggested, as a result of re-editing of the original composition in the 9th or 10th cnetury by two different people.[35] To substantiate his conclusions, James presented the following evidence. First, he listed certain phrases as "unmistakably Christian," on the basis of parallels in the New Testament. For example, he cited the following similarities.[36]

---

[31] So, Denis, Pseudépigraphes Grecs, p. 31. See also Harrelson, "The Significance of 'Last Words' for Intertestamental Ethics," in Essays in Old Testament Ethics, edited by James L. Crenshaw and John T. Willis, pp. 203-213.

[32] For a summary of the book, see: Ginzberg, JE 1(1901): 93-96; Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 113-114. For the full Greek text, see M. R. James, The Testament of Abraham(Cambridge: At the University Press, 1892). James's text is translated by Michael E. Stone, The Testament of Abraham. The Greek Recensions(Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

[33] See Rowley, ibid., pp. 113-114; Aage Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament(Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad Publisher, 1957), 2: 250-251.

Ch. IV.	"refraining from any evil action" = I Thess. 5:22, "abstain from every form of evil." Also, from this chapter he noted, "I shall send my holy spirit . . ."
Ch. VI.	the phrase: "Glory and praise from God and Father."
Ch. VII.	"I am Michael the Archistrategos who stands before God, and I was sent to you to announce" = Luke 1:19, "I am Gabriel, who stands in the presence of God; and I was sent to speak to you . . ." (cf. Rev. 8:2)
Ch. X.	"These are thieves who . . . steal and kill and destroy." = John 10:10, "The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy; . . ."
Ch. XI.	"the one way was narrow and tortuous and the other was wide and spacious . . . for the lost are many but the saved are few" = Matt. 7:13-14, "Enter by the narrow gate;

---

[34] James, The Testament of Abraham, pp. 23, 55. James paralleled the composition of the Testament to the Ascension of Isaiah with its Jewish groundwork (the Martyrdom) and the "Vision" and other smaller sections, which are clearly Christian. He fails to consider the specific and obvious Christian features in the Ascension not found in the Testament of Abraham, whose features are "Christian" only when strained.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Cited from Stone, The Testament of Abraham. The Greek Recensions. New Testament passages cited from RSV.

> for the gage is wide and the way is easy that leads to destruction and those who enter it are many. For the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life, and those who find it are few."

Ch. XIII. "and in the second coming every breath and creation shall be judged by the twelve tribes of Israel." = Luke 22:30, ". . . that you may . . . sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Second, James pointed out features in Recension A which he called "mediaeval matter"--the introductory sentences, much of the speech of God to Michael in Section VIII, the speech of Death to Abraham, and the description of Death. He attributed all of this to a redactor, who he believed came very late.[37] He further noted late forms and constructions in vocabulary and grammar. For example, he noted εἰπεῖν τινὰ without πρὸς in Section I, etc., and ἀπὸ with an accusation in Section VIII. He designated as late the following words: χαρζαναί (XII), δουλίδες (XVII), ἀνύπαρκτος (XIX), and the epithets such as ἡλιόρατος ἡλιόμορφος πανιερός.[38]

---

[37] James, The Testament of Abraham, p. 51. Kohler, who drew just the opposite conclusion (i.e., the book is purely Jewish and early), remarked that "the grand topic of the Divina Comedia . . . occupied the minds of the Jewish Essenes long before the Church took hold of it." "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada--The Apocalypse of Abraham and Its Kindred," JQR, o.s. 7(1894/95): 606. Nigel Turner, "The 'Testament of Abraham': Problems in Biblical Greek," NTS 1(1954/55): 219-223, agreed with James that the final form of the document was probably medieval but pointed out the "many doctrines belonging to early, even pre-Tannaitic, Judaism."(p. 219)

[38] James, The Testament of Abraham, p. 51.

In analyzing the text, James contended that the Christian phrases and quotations could be omitted without injury to the sense of the composition in every part of the book except the apocalyptic section. (This was to him a further substantiation of his notion that the narrative used already existing Jewish legends, while the apocalyptic section was an original composition of a Jewish Christian writer.) The conception of the two gates and two ways and of the few saved and many lost is found in this section (ch. 11). Since James believed that the original author's main purpose was "to give publicity to his views on the judgment of souls," he argued that this passage was "the kernel of the whole book." He was convinced that the episode was founded on the Matthew 7 passage, since "the actual language of the Gospel is used in both recensions," and declared that "it would be doing violence to all probability to look elsewhere for the source of it."[39]

In the introduction to his translation of the text in 1926, W. A. Craigie apparently accepted the conclusions set forth by James. Even though he acknowledged the tone of the work to be Jewish rather than Christian, he still assumed that the author was probably a Jewish Christian since "phrases and conceptions of a New Testament character appear in it."[40] Just as James had done before him, Craigie rested his entire case on these parallel phrases and ideas.

---

[39] Ibid., p. 52.

That signs of Christian usage and some retouching are present seems clear. First, the gloss in two MSS. in ch. XI, the passage of the two gates, seems clearly Christian. At the end of the line which reads, "Outside of the two gates there, they saw a man sitting on a golden throne, and that man's appearance was fearsome, like the Master's," two MSS. add the words: "Of our Lord Jesus Christ." Second, the doxologies (both Recensions) are decidely Christian. Recension A reads:

> After which we too, O my beloved brethren, let us imitate the hospitality of the patriarch Abraham, and let us gain his virtuous way of life that we may be worthy of eternal life, praising the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. His is the glory and the power forever. Amen.[42]

Similarly, Recension B reads:

> And Isaac buried his father near his mother Sarah, praising and praying to God, for Him glory is fitting and honor and devotion, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and always and forever and ever. Amen.[43]

---

[40] W. A. Craigie (trans.), "The Testament of Abraham," in The Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 9, 5th ed., pp. 183-201. Edited by Allan Menzies(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926).

[41] The citation is from Stone, The Testament of Abraham, The Greek Recensions, p. 27. Stone translates δεσπδτης as "Master." Craigie, ibid., translated it "Lord."

[42] Ibid., p. 57. [43] Ibid., p. 87.

It is impossible to determine when these doxologies were added to the Testament.

On the other hand, to attempt to build, as James did, a case for Christian origin for the entire document on the basis of phrases and ideas similar to known Christian compositions has no persuasive force. His arguments for Christian origin have gained little headway in subsequent scholarship.[44] The consensus has been that it is a Jewish work with some slight Christian additions. Kaufmann Kohler, writing only two years after James published his Greek text of the Testament, acknowledged the merit of the work but was critical of his failure to consider the probability of the Jewish origin and character of the document. Kohler contended that

> the conception is so entirely Jewish, and so cosmopolitan in form and spirit, that we do not hesitate to accord this Apocryphon a rank equalling the Book of Tobit, not to say the Book of Jonah.[45]

Kohler presented evidence for the document's early and Jewish origin. First, he believed that the presentation of the narrative as a romance and the fact that the chronology does not go along with the biblical account indicates its antiquity and speaks against its being attributed to a second century Christian.[46] Second, "the Jewish idea of strict justice pervades," and there is no place for Christ as judge nor as "an atoning high priest who obtains mercy for the sinner by his vicarious sacrifice."[47] Third, the description of Death as "the ancient angel of death as . . . in the Books of Chronicles . . . the personification of physical evil . . . but not of moral evil" is a strong argument against Christian authorship. Death, in the Testament, is an agent of God rather than His enemy, as the Christians described him.[48] Kohler concluded that, with the exception of "the Christian doxology" which ends the book, this writing "is from beginning to end Jewish."[49]

---

[44] UJE 1(1939): 40, says without elaboration that the document was "most likely . . . written by a Jew or Jewish Christian" in the second century. Although the question is left open, there is an underlying recognition of the common stock of ideas belonging to both Christians and Jews. In the light of the Jewish legends surrounding Abraham, there is no problem in ascribing to this writing Jewish origin.

[45] Kohler, "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada," JQR, o.s. 7(1894-95): 581.

Ginzberg also was critical of James's position and sided with Kohler, arguing that "apart from some late Christological additions made in a few manuscripts by copyists, there is not a single Christian interpolation in the whole book."[50] He sought to refute James's position on two major points. First, even to the smallest details, the contents of the Testament are paralleled in rabbinical literature.[51]

---

[46] Ibid. [47] Ibid., pp. 588-589.
[48] Ibid., pp. 591-592. [49] Ibid.
[50] Ginzberg, JE 1(1901): 95. [51] Ibid.

Second, Ginzberg argued that James erroneously drew parallels between this document and the New Testament without consideration of the larger Jewish background. For example, according to James, Michael's role as "chief-captain" sent to "announce" (VII) is paralleled to Luke 1:19, where Gabriel is named. Ginzberg contended that Michael's role as described in the Testament of Abraham accords with "ancient Jewish angelology" where Michael is "the heavenly chieftain of Israel."[52] He argued that James was in error also in suggesting that the idea of the "two ways" and the "two gates" (XI) was dependent upon Matt. 7:13. Ginzberg maintained that the "Two Ways" was originally a Jewish work known to Johanan b. Zakkai (ber. 28b) and was found also in the Greek allegorical work, "Tabula Cebetis," written by Cebes, a pupil of Socrates.[53] Another passage to which James gave special emphasis was Luke 22:30, which he believed to be the source for the judgment scene in ch. XIII. of the Testament. Ginzberg argued that the Luke passage "presents the Christianized view of the Jewish doctrine concerning 'the future judgment of the world by the twelve tribes of Israel' . . . " In addition to its appearance in the Testament of Abraham, it is also expressed in Yalk. Sh., Dan. § 1065: "In the time to come the Lord will sit in judgment and the great of

---

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

Israel will sit on thrones prepared by the angels and judge the heathen nations alongside of the Lord." Luke has reversed the idea, and rather than the tribes judging they are being judged. Ginzberg concluded: "The very spirit of this passage is decidedly non-Christian. It does not contain so much as an allusion to the Messiah as judge. The very belief in a personal Messiah seems to be unknown; . . . "[54]

On the basis of the name of the angel Dokiel (ch. XIII) and the allusions to Azazel and Samael, and especially the misunderstanding of the Greek translator at certain points, Ginzberg saw clear indications of a Hebrew original. He was critical of James's relating the expression "thrice holy" (ch. XX) to the Christian trinity and contended that it was rather "the translation of the rabbinical term, shillush kedushah, for the angelic song (Isa. vi. 3, Tanna debe Eliyahu R. vi.)."[55]

In the light of the evidence, there is no reason to interpret the Testament of Abraham other than as a Jewish work, which has obvious Christian glosses in some MSS. and ends with a clearly Christian doxology.

---

[54] Ibid. G. H. Box, The Testament of Abraham(London: Society for the Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1927), pp. vii-xxix, also argued against James's views. On the passage concerning judgment by the twelve tribes, which he described as "thoroughly Jewish" and "certainly not Christian," he remarked: "In fact so strongly did the Christian copyists feel this that in some of the MSS. a clause is introduced which runs: And at the second coming the twelve tribes shall be judged by the apostles!" (p. xvi)

[55] Ibid., p. 96.

The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch

The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (=III Baruch) has some affinity with II Baruch (in its lament over the fall of Jerusalem) and II Enoch (in Baruch's travels through the seven heavens). R. Travers Herford bemoaned the fact that so much detail is given to the trivialities of Baruch's heavenly visits and contains "little trace of the lofty purpose which is the chief if not the only justification of Apocalypse as a literary form."[56] Herford refers here to the lofty ethical teachings which he claimed characterized all writings of Judaism, including the apocalyptic writings. He noted the list of sins given in 13:4 and indicated that this "may help to give an ethical colour to the work."[57]

D. S. Russell listed two reasons for interest in III Baruch. First, it stresses the mediation of angels who carry men's prayers and the reports of their good works to Michael, who in turn rewards men according to their good deeds. Second, it emphasizes the idea of seven heavens, found elsewhere in rabbinic literature.[58]

Despite the reluctance to assign it any great merit, scholars have generally agreed that III Baruch was originally a Jewish work, was written in Greek, and is to be dated near the end of the first century or early in the second century.[59]

---

[56] Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha, p. 260. [57] Ibid.

[58] Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, p. 66.

Scholars have been almost unanimous in recognizing two interpolated passages, ch. 4 and chs. 11-17, although there has been little agreement as to the extent of the Christian reworking of these sections.[60] In ch. 4 the discussion centers on the tree which caused Adam to sin--the vine. Right in the middle of this section which condemns the vine comes a statement of its goodness, apparently because of its use in the Sacrament. Hughes bracketed the entire passage, verses 9-15, as a Christian modification of the expressed attitude toward wine, although only verse 15 changes the basic tone of the passage.[61] It reads:

> But God sent his angel Sarasael, and said to him, Arise, Noah, and plant the shoot of the vine, for thus saith the Lord: Its bitterness shall be changed into sweetness, and its curse shall become a blessing, and that which is produced from it shall become the blood of God; as through it the human race obtained condemnation, so again through Jesus Christ the Immanuel will they receive in Him the upward calling, and the entry into paradise.[62]

---

[59] Ibid., pp. 65-66. See too: Denis, *Pseudépigraphes Grecs*, pp. 79-84; W. Werbeck, *RGG*^{3} 1(1957): cols. 900-903; Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, pp. 440-442.

[60] Ibid., p. 65. See also, H. Maldwyn Hughes, "The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch," in *APOT* 2: 529-530.

[61] *APOT* 2: 536.

[62] Ibid.

Although the reference to "the blood of God" and "Jesus Christ the Immanuel" are unmistakably Christian, the sense of the passage is disturbed by this complete reversal of the thought. An insistence that the entire passage has been interpolated fails to recognize its composite character and its resulting self inconsistency.[63] J.-C. Picard suggested that only one verse (4:15) should be considered as a Christian interpolation, which was "rather clumsily" inserted "in the place of a short passage, now lost."[64] He gave no indication as to what the lost passage might have contained.

Picard concluded that III Baruch, chs. 11-17 "has an internal coherence, and contains no obvious Christian interpolation."[65] He contended that the only reason to assume that these chapters are the work of a Christian redactor was the insistence of some scholars on an 'original text' which described the sixth and seventh heavens. He, however, believed that III Baruch never contained such descriptions.[66] The assumption that there had been such an original document which perhaps had changed in the process of use and transmission was given a degree of support by pointing to the Christian character of this section.[67] Hughes, a defender of the Christian origin of these chapters, pointed to only two Christian interpolations. The first, 13:4, mentions the Church; the second, 15:4, parallels, in part, Matt. 25:21.[68] The evidence does not substantiate the contention of Hughes and others that this section of III Baruch is to be read as a Christian redaction.

---

[63] Both M. R. James, Apocrypha Anecdota II(Cambridge: At the University Press, 1897), p. LXII, and Hughes, APOT 2: 536, made this error in their work with III Baruch.

[64] J.-C. Picard, Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece, in vol. 2: Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece, pp. 75-78. Edited by A. M. Denis and M. de Jonge (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967). See also, Ginzberg, JE 2 (1902): 551.

[65] Ibid. Cf. Ginzberg, ibid., who also insisted upon the Jewish character of this entire section.

[66] Ibid., p. 77.

The Book of the Secrets of Enoch

There is a great deal of debate regarding the origin and date of the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, called also Slavonic Enoch, since it is extant only in that language, or II Enoch, to distinguish it from Ethiopic or I Enoch. Otto Eissfeldt believed that the document presupposes the existence of the Temple (e.g., 51:4; 59:1-2; 61:4; 62:1) and thus the original must have been a pre-70 A.D. Jewish work. In its present form, however, he contended that it was "undoubtedly of Christian origin and hardly datable before the seventh century A.D."[69] F. C. Porter maintained that the implied notion that the Temple was still standing is the only indication of date. He concluded that the book, for the most part, was unmistakably Jewish, although there are hints of foreign influence as well as ethical teachings suggesting a few Christian interpolations.[70]

---

[67] APOT 2: 528-530.

[68] Ibid., pp. 529-530. His interpretation seems strained, as well as highly imaginative. He sees the angels with full baskets to be representing Christians, those with half-full baskets represent the half-converted Jew, and those with empty baskets represent those openly opposed the Gospel.

[69] Eissfeldt, The Old Testament 2:633.

R. H. Charles sought to establish a date for the document on the basis of writings which used and were used by the author and concluded that the earlier limit probably "lies between 30 B.C. and the Christian era."[71] He based the later limit (70 A.D.) on several facts: (1) the temple was still standing; (2) the text was probably known to the New Testament writers; and (3) it was known and used also by the writers of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Ascension of Isaiah. Charles thus set the date of the present text, which he believed to be based, in part, on a pre-Christian Hebrew original, to the period of 1-50 A.D.[72] He emphasized the similarity of thought and diction between II Enoch and the New Testament, so much so that "a few phrases in the New Testament may be derived from it."[73] The only phrases and words bracketed as Christian are the names of the days of the week: 29:1 = "Monday is the first day"; 30:1 = "Tuesday"; 30:2 ="Wednesday"; etc.[74] No reason is given for seeing these words as Christian; nothing appears to depend on them one way or another.

---

[70] F. C. Porter, The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), pp. 332-334.

[71] R. H. Charles and W. R. Morfill, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, pp. xxv-xxvi.

[72] Ibid., p. xxvi.

[73] APOT 2: 425, 428.

André Vaillant argued that the composition was the work of a Jewish Christian. His conclusion rested primarily on certain "Christian elements" in the text: (1) the author's lenient attitude toward the Watchers (ch. 7ff.); (2) the number of beatitudes in 52:1ff., corresponding to Matt. 5:3-10; and (3) other Christian phraseology.[75] Such evidence seems quite inconclusive, if not entirely unconvincing. Arie Rubinstein, who argued also for Christian origin of the present text of II Enoch, illustrated the weakness of Vaillant's evidence in his comment on the beatitudes section. He pointed out that none of them really corresponded in ethical quality to those of Matt. 5:3-10 and noted how remarkable it was

> that a Jewish-Christian author should so completely hide his light under a bushel and leave the reader to divine the Christian origin of the beatitudes from the fact that there are eight of them.[76]

---

[74] Ibid., pp. 447ff.

[75] A. Vaillant, Le Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch. Texte Slave et Traduction Francaise (Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 1952), pp. X-XI. Vaillant cited 22:6-16 for the beatitudes; this is obviously a misprint for 52:1ff. which we have cited.

[76] Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Henoch," JJS 13 (1962): 11-12. See also the review of Vaillant's work by Jean Danielou, RSR 43 (1955): 569-572.

Although he was critical of both Vaillant's evidence for Christian origin and Charles's position in favor of an early Jewish origin, Rubinstein concluded in favor of Christian authorship for the whole of II Enoch. Admitting his reluctance to argue from silence, he nonetheless did just that. He noted: (1) there are no clear cut indications of Jewish background; (2) there is no trace of the recapitulation of Jewish history which is found in the Similitudes of Ethiopic Enoch; and (3) the eschatology of II Enoch is completely "devoid of the note of Jewish nationalism," a feature found in Ethiopic Enoch.[77] Rubinstein's position appears to be as weak as those he criticized. His first point is simply inconclusive, and points two and three assume a more direct relationship between I and II Enoch than the evidence permits. Rubinstein is conclusive only in pointing out that II Enoch presents to the reader something different both in its apocalyptic presentation and its eschatology.

For the purpose of this discussion, only one other study needs to be mentioned. In 1965, C. F. Potter wrote a book entitled Did Jesus Write This Book?[78] "The Book" Potter was talking about in his title is II Enoch; the question posed by the title, he argued, could be answered positively. Although it is an interesting and entertaining book, the case presented is weak, almost to the point of absurdity. The only evidence cited are parallels drawn between the New Testament (primarily the Gospels) and II Enoch. For example, Potter compared what Jesus had to say about "human relations" to what the writer of II Enoch said. In parallel columns, he presented these teachings under ten specific subject headings, ranging from "Charity and Benevolence" to "Kindness to Animals."[79] One or two illustrations will suffice. Under "Charity and Benevolence," he cited (in full) these parallels: II En. 9:1; 42:8; 44:4; 50:5 = Matt. 25: 34-40; II En. 51:1-2 = Mark 10:21. For "Anger and Murder," he noted: II En. 60:2-4 = Matt. 5: 21. Under "Humility," these passages are listed: II En. 7:5; 63:1-4; 66:6 = Matt. 5:3, 5; 11:29; 18:4; 23:12; Mark 10:43-44; Luke 14:8. He drew several parallels for "Kindness to Animals": II En. 58:2-6; 59:1, 5 = Matt. 6:26; 10:29 (Luke 12:6); Luke 14:5 (Matt. 12:11). The weakness of this method is self evident.

---

[77] Ibid., pp. 12-15.

[78] C. F. Potter, Did Jesus Write This Book? (New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1965).

To sum up, two positions have found followers. The majority of scholars have seen Slavonic Enoch as an early Jewish work, notwithstanding its lack of messianic allusions, its expanded angelology, its individualized eschatology, and its stress on the weighing of souls. Other scholars have attempted to prove its Christian origin or a high degree of Christian redaction for the writing. The evidence for this position has consisted primarily of parallels in ideas and phraseology with similar New Testament materials. Those holding this position appear to have read a great into the text, and those who accept their evidence must do the same.

---

[79] Ibid., pp. 80-91.

F. C. Burkitt made only a brief comment on II Enoch and did not attempt to draw any conclusions regarding the many questions about the writing. He spoke volumes, however, in his terse precautionary note: "I do not know that a Christian romance of Enoch need differ very much from a Jewish romance of Enoch."[80] In short, unless there are textual reasons for regarding a text as interpolated or redacted, or unless obviously Christian ideas can be isolated in a text, the interpreter is safer to asume its Jewish origin. Even if a text is thoroughly Jewish, given the common stock of ideas shared by Jews and Christians, the interpreter has to acknowledge the possibility that it may still be a Christian text.

II Esdras (= 4 Ezra)

The question of Christian additions to 4 Ezra concerns only the obvious insertion of the name of Jesus in the

---

[80] F. C. Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, p. 76.

Latin of 7:28, which is easily removed on textual grounds, and chs. 1-2 and chs. 15-16, which are found also in the Latin and considered by most scholars to be of Christian origin.[81] Most scholars have simply designated these sections as later Christian additions without elaboration.[82]

In 1703, Fabricius argued, on the basis of the four Christian chapters and the reference to Jesus in 7:28, that the whole work came from a Jew converted to Christianity. From subsequent knowledge of the Latin MSS., as well as from the other versions of the writing, this position proved groundless.[83] Another similar position, but with even less critical substance, was presented by

---

[81] See, NTA 2: 689-703, where chs. 1-2 and 15-16 are entitled the Fifth and Sixth Books of Esra respectively. Duensing maintained a Greek original on linguistic observations, which has been confirmed for chs. 15-16 by a fragment (15:57-59) discovered among the Oxyrhynchus papyri (p. 689). Charles used the Latin designations and labeled chs. 1-2 "2 Esdras" and chs. 15-16 "5 Esdras"(APOT 2:542-543).

[82] E.g., Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, p. 62; Hugo Fuchs, UJE 4 (1941): 163; Schurer, History of the Jewish People 3 (1896): 94; Eissfeldt, The Old Testament. An Introduction 2: 625; Denis, Pseudepigraphes Grecs, p. 195; Torrey, Apocryphal Literature, p. 117.

[83] Fabricius, Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, Hamburgi, 1703, p. 936 sq., cited by James Drummond, The Jewish Messiah, p. 90 note. Cf. J. Bloch, "Some Christological Interpolations in the Ezra-Apocalypse," HThR 51 (1958): 87-94, who presents a convincing case that every mention of "son" (7:28, 29; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9) represents the efforts of the Christian redactor "to give the entire book a decidedly Christian color"(p. 91).

John E. H. Thomson in 1891. As he had done with the Ascension of Isaiah, so Thomson did with this writing. In an imaginative fashion, he pictured the author of II Esdras as a Jewish Christian who goes to Rome after 70 A.D. Leaving Jerusalem desolate and bemoaning the fate of the city, he sees wealthy Jews in Rome in high places.

> He fancies how Ezra would have felt in Babylon among wealthy Jews who cared not how Zion lay desolate, and it seems to him as if the spirit of Ezra was upon him.[84]

This, to Thomson, easily explains the origin and the purpose of the book.

Positions like these were rare and gained no headway among scholars who worked with II Esdras. On textual grounds most of the questions can be answered regarding the integrity of the work. The remaining questions regarding chs. 1-2 and 15-16 generally have to do with the Christian attraction to, and usage of, this genuinely Jewish Ezra-Apocalypse, chs. 3-14.

The evidence presented is of two kinds. First, there is manuscript evidence, which is the most conspicuous. Chs. 1-2 and 15-16 are absent from all the earlier oriental texts. The Latin text, which contains the entire document, differentiates "Esdrae tertius" (1-2), "Esdrae quartus" (3-14), and "Esdrae quintus" (15-16).[85]

---

[84] John E. H. Thomson, Books Which Influenced Our Lord, p. 348.

[85] So, W. O. E. Oesterley, "The Messianic Teaching of IV. Esdras," IJA xi(October 1907): 8-10. Cf. APOT 2:542-543.

Second, most scholars point also to content evidence. Chs. 1-2 are described as "an anti-Jewish addition" to the original Jewish text.[86] Duensing suggested that the first part of this section has utilized existing Jewish material which "has been worked over by a Christian hand (see 1. 11; 1. 24; 1. 30 and especially 1. 35-40) to provide an invective against the Jewish people."[87] The second part (2:10-48) brings comforting promises to the Christians, and Duensing maintained, "is purely Christian, in spite of 2. 33, 42, etc., which are decorative."[88]

Chs. 15-16 are not of an apocalyptic character but contain a denunciation of the nations in the style of the Old Testament prophets. Most scholars have stressed the words and ideas in these chapters reminiscent of the New Testament. Oesterley wrote that this section is so saturated with New Testament ideas that "it is impossible not to see the influence of the Christian Scriptures upon it . . . "[89] Compare, for example, the following passages:

II Esdras 15:8-9 = Rev. 6:10; 19:2
II Esdras 15:25 = Matt. 24:29; Rev. 14:20
II Esdras 15:49 = Rev. 18:7-8
II Esdras 16:41ff= I Cor. 7:29-31

---

[86] Nigel Turner, "Esdras, Books of," IDB 2(1962): 142. See also, Littmann and Kohler, JE 4(1903): 221, and Duensing, "The Fifth and Sixth Books of Esra," NTA 2: 689.

[87] Ibid.

[88] Ibid.

[89] Oesterley, "Messianic Teaching of IV. Esdras," IJA xi (October 1907): 9-10; see also, H. St. J. Thackeray, DB(H) 1 (1911): 763-766.

That such argument on the basis of similar phraseology and ideas is always to some extent debatable is illustrated in the suggestion made without elaboration by Enno Littmann and Kaufmann Kohler, that chs. 15-16 "may be Jewish."[90]

The Sibylline Oracles

The Sibyls in antiquity were "women who in a state of ecstasy proclaimed coming events, generally unpleasant, spontaneously and without being asked or being connected with any particular oracle-site."[91] They were originally associated with the Persian or Iranian region and from there came to the Greeks. Jewish and later Christian propaganda

> made use of this literature in order to express . . . its own concern particularly in regard to polytheism and idolatry. To the unrepentant Gentile the coming last judgment is foretold.[92]

In this process, pagan models were used and modified, and frequently new oracles were produced. B. Thompson suggested that a cultivated Jew living in Egypt about the middle of the second century B.C. was "probably responsible for the first Jewish oracles." Thompson contended that this writer "did not simply invent Sibylline verses," but rather pieced together ancient oracles, adding passages of his own, "which breathed strong monotheism and the glorifivation of the Jewish people."[93] Thus, the basic theme of the Jewish Oracles became monotheism. They, in turn, condemned idolatry, polytheism, pagan divinities, and worship of sacred animals.[94] All of this became a concerted effort to win foreign admiration for Judaism by clothing Jewish teachings in "a Sibylline disguise."[95]

---

[90] JE 5 (1903): 221.

[91] A. Kurfess, "Christian Sibyllines," in NTA 2: 703-704. See pp. 703-709 for a brief history of the Sibyls from the Persian/Iranian origin to their adaptation by Jewish and Christian writers.

[92] Weiser, The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development, p. 424.

The Christians didto the Jewish Oracles what the Jews had done to the pagan ones--they adapted them, added to them, and copied them. Schürer contended that both "Jewish and Christian authors respectively made the ancient Sibyl speak to the heathen nations in Greek hexameters, and in the language of Homer."[96] The Christian Sibyl did not claim to be Hebraic, "but explicitly pagan."[97] Of the

---

[93] B. Thompson, "Patristic Use of the Sibylline Oracles," RR 16 (1951-52): 125.

[94] Ibid., p. 126.

[95] So, Israel Abrahams, A Short History of Jewish Literature(London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906), pp. 11-18. Schürer, History of the Jewish People 3:270-292, discussed the Sibyllines under the broad topic: "Jewish Propaganda Under a Heathen Mask."

[96] Ibid., p. 275.

[97] Thompson, "Patristic Use of the Sibylline Oracles," RR 16 (1951-52): 127.

Christian Sibyl, Thompson wrote that "the 'mortals throughout Hellas" would not have called her foreign." The use of the popular pagan Sibyl "was an appeal to pagans, based on a theory of Divine inspiration working in the past outside Israel."[98]

Two observations may be helpful in approaching the Sibylline Oracles. The first is what Schürer called the curse of pseudonymity. Every reader and writer

> allowed himself to complete what existed after his own pleasures, and to arrange the scattered papers now in one, now in an opposite manner.[99]

The result was a chaotic wilderness which became impossible to sift and arrange. The present collection of Oracles is a general mixture of pagan, Jewish, and Christian materials, sometimes impossible to differentiate.[100] Schürer also maintained that much of the material is "of so neutral a character that it may just as well have proceeded from one side as from the other."[101]

---

[98] Ibid. Cf. Paul's use of pagan poetry in his appeal to the philosophers at Mars Hill, Acts 17:27ff. See, "Review of Works Relating to Sibylline Oracles," Edinburgh Review (July 1877): 31-67, where the question of the moral issue is raised regarding the "manifest effort at concealment" by the Jewish and Christian writers. This article suggests that this is more than a literary device, but indeed "a pious fraud."

[99] Schürer, History of the Jewish People 3: 276.

[100] Ibid. See also, Samuel Kraus, "Sibyl," JE 11(1908): 320-321, and George Fox, "Sibylline Books," UJE 9(1943): 525, who reached the same conclusion.

[101] Ibid.

A second conclusion can be drawn from the survey of the literature--namely, specific Christian materials are recognized, in many cases, by their direct allusions to Jesus or their obvious animosity toward the Jews.[102] The following passages cited from the translation of the Greek text of Kurfess and Geffcken presented in the Hennecke-Schneemelcher *New Testament Apocrypha* will illustrate the obvious Christian elements found in the Oracles.[103]

> Book I: 323a When the maid shall give birth to
> the Logos of God most High, . . .
>
> 323c Then from the east shall a star
> shine forth . . .
>
> 324 Yea, then shall the Son of the
> great God come to men,
> 325 Clothed in flesh, . . .
>
> 334 To Him shall priests bring and
> offer gold
> 335 And myrrh and frankincense; . . .
>
> 351 Then shall he heal the sick and all
> the afflicted,
> 352 As many as put their trust in
> him.
> 353 And the blind shall see, and
> the lame walk,
> 354 And the deaf shall hear, and
> they that speak not shall
> speak;

---

[102] So, Fox, "Sibylline Books," *UJE* 9 (1943): 525, and Kraus, "Sibyl," *JE* 11 (1908): 321.

[103] *NTA* 2: 709-745. The citations are given by Book (I, etc.) and Line (305, etc.).

Book VI: 13 He shall walk the waves, and deliver men from sickness,
14 He shall raise up the dead, and banish many pains.

Book VIII: 275 And from five loaves and fish of the sea
276 He shall feed five thousand men in the desert, . . .

294 And he shall wear the crown of thorns; . . .
295 They shall pierce his sides . . .

305 But the veil of the temple was rent, . . .

456 And in the last times he changed his abode, and coming as a child
457 From the womb of the Virgin Mary he arose, a new light.
458 From heaven he came, and put on mortal form.

477 Bethlehem was chosen the homeland, divinely elect, of the Logos
478 And the swaddled child was shown to God's obedient in a manger.[104]
479 To herdsmen of cattle and goats and shepherds of sheep.

Conclusion

Several conclusions emerge from the survey of these seven documents. First, for the most part, scholars generally interpret them as originally Jewish writings. Second, many of these writings do show signs of some Christian reworking. Third, the interpreter must be aware of the large and inevitable areas of overlapping and common tradition created by the Jewish milieu of early Christianity and not read into these documents "Christian" ideas which are not obviously Christian. Fourth, the discovery of words and ideas which parallel similar materials in the New Testament does not alone constitute evidence for Christian origin or Christian influence.

---

[104] See NTA 2: 704. The line sequence was 478, "Bethlehem . . .," 477, "And the swaddled child . . ."--obviously a misprint since no explanation is given for the rearranging of the text.

CHAPTER V

OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

The texts examined in this study were chosen because scholars generally agree that they are Jewish writings which contain later Christian interpolations. The discussion of methodology has been guided by one question--how have scholars isolated these Christian passages from the original Jewish texts? Tentative conclusions have been suggested in the course of the discussion. Surveying the representative positions presented in the preceding chapters, we are now able, in this final chapter, briefly to retrace our steps and state as succinctly as possible the procedures observed in the works of scholars whose positions have been sketched, to formulate the questions raised but not always answered by these methods, and to describe the dilemmas created by these positions. Once this is done, some pressing needs which have emerged from the methodological analysis will be suggested in an attempt to offer direction and perspective to the future study of these documents.

In almost every case, the interpretation of the documents under consideration in this study has come to one of three conclusions. First, that the document is

Jewish, and if there are Christian interpolations there is no clear way to identify these with any certainty because of the Jewish milieu of the early Christian community. This position stresses the inevitable and large stock of shared ideas brought about by this "Jewish setting" out of which the early Christian community emerged. Advocates of this view insist that unless there are obvious Christian ideas and motifs (e.g., the gloss of the name Jesus here and there and the abtrusive Trinitarian formula in the doxologies) the document is to be taken as Jewish. A second view saw the document to be Jewish with later Christian interpolations which can be isolated and bracketed within the original Jewish writing. In almost every case, a third interpretation was presented--namely, that the document is Christian; the writer may have utilized Jewish traditions, but the document is Christian nonetheless. Strangely enough these alternatives, though contrary, are built on the same basic evidence, though interpreted quite differently by each.

R. H. Charles well illustrates the view that these documents are Jewish with Christian interpolations and additions. In fact, there is little dispute between scholars holding this view and those mentioned above who argued for Jewish origin for the documents in their intirety. Charles's position is basically a conservative one. Most of the documents examined in this study purport to be Jewish; Charles's analysis began there and moved to ask the question, if necessary: are there additions or interpolations? There may be points at which the question is not even raised. In short, the issue of interpolation is one that emerges from the analysis of the text itself. It is not brought in as a preconceived notion.

An opposite tendency can be seen in the work done on I Enoch. The use of the phrase "Son of Man" in the Similitudes (chs. 37-71) was a signal to some scholars that something reminiscent of the Gospels is here. This observation led in two directions. Earlier scholars assumed immediately that the entire Enoch text was Christian, on the assumption that if a text contains Christian or Christian-sounding ideas, it must be Christian. There were others who saw the "Son of Man" passages as interpolations into an otherwise thoroughly Jewish text. Both of these views rested primarily on the assumption that the "Son of Man" idea could not be Jewish, in spite of the use of the phrase in Ezekiel and Daniel, and in spite of evidence widely taken at that time to show that such a concept was well developed in Judaism prior to the beginning of the Christian era. Charles, on the other hand, gave no consideration even to the possibility of the Similitudes being originally Christian or interpolated by Christians, since he believed that the Son of Man concept was already a well-developed one in pre-Christian Judaism. But whether "Son of Man" was taken to be Jewish or Christian, it should be noted that the problem was raised not by the use of the phrase in Enoch but rather by its use in the New Testament. The Enoch text itself was not suspect; it only became so on the basis of external parallels.

Charles's method embraces several elements. As stated above, he begins with the document's obvious appearance. For the texts under consideration here, that appearance is unmistakably Jewish. Beginning with that assumption (which in his analysis he subsequently tested), his method is not unique but simply employs the kind of evidence used in almost every scholarly attempt to locate interpolated materials: (1) variations in MSS; (2) breaks in the continuity and unity of the passage; (3) literary clues--i.e., poetry, parallelism, and the like. Once interpolations are isolated, the identification of them as Christian depends no longer on such literary or textual details but simply on their contents; can the notions expressed be labeled as characteristically Christian?

Thus, despite the fact that he begins with an analysis of the texts themselves, Charles's approach, like the approach taken by many who claim Christian origin for these materials, turns on the question: what is Jewish and what is Christian? Opinions concerning such a detail as the phrase "Son of Man" can change, and indeed have continued to change. But the issue at stake is a broad one. Of course, some ideas can be labeled with certainty as Jewish;

others can with the same certainty be labeled Christian. The obvious gives no problem. The problem arises from the presence of a whole area of shared materials and ideas, the common milieu of Jews and Christians, and this problem requires further clarification.

An idea which is not specifically Christian is not necessarily to be designated "Jewish." Its origin may be uncertain, and the use of a tradition does not by itself betray that origin. On the other hand, its origin may be quite certain, but its later use may not remain congruous with it. Once a tradition exists it may become part of the message of anyone who knows it and wants to use it. So, for example, to conclude that the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs is produced by a Jewish author merely because it is based partly on an Old Testament narrative may be correct, but it need not be. Some scholars (e.g., de Jonge) have argued for a Christian author. In spite of the Jewish nature of the materials, de Jonge can indeed argue this position because the Old Testament was the "bible" of the early Christians. Early Christians were themselves Jews and these "Jewish" writings were theirs. To be sure, the Testaments cannot be considered Christian solely on the basis of ideas held by both Jews and Christians. This point is made in Charles's criticism of those scholars who tried to bracket all the ethical passages in the Testaments as Christian. Schürer's remark that the material in some of the Sibylline Oracles could have come from either Jews or Christians also cautions us not to draw hasty conclusions on lines too sharply drawn between what is Jewish and what is Christian.

Still, de Jonge's point cannot easily be dismissed. All these materials, with or without identifiable Crhistian additions, were no doubt considered "Christian" by the early Christian communities who appropriated them. The whole of the Hebrew Bible had been taken over--without change--as the "Christian Bible." This body of Jewish writings, too, though not seen as sacred scripture, was nonetheless adopted, adapted, copied, and preserved by Christians. Even additions made must, in a sense, be seen as part of their appreciation and appropriation of the original document. They were not merely making it Christian by something extraneous and foreign to it. They were rather resonating to the "Christian" message which they believed to be already present in it. The question is whether criteria are available that might enable these questions to be refined in such a way as to make further progress possible.

One possibility is suggested by the terms "redaction" and "interpolation." The discussions here surveyed revolve heavily around these terms , but their meanings remain general and their application imprecise. An "interpolator" is understood to be one who inserts alien materials and fringe ideas that do not fit the context, and his presence is betrayed by disturbances in the unity and continuity of a document. Generally that has meant a Christian adding materials to a Jewish document. A "redactor" is one who makes use of traditions of which he is heir in the composition of a document. Generally that has meant a Christian drawing a Jewish legacy in the process of composition. Clearly these distinctions do not suffice. Disturbances of continuity are not caused by interpolation alone, and the possibility of various levels of Jewish redaction in some of these documents, before any Christian additions were made, reappears at many points in the literature surveyed. And "Christianizing" editing is very likely to have been more complex than the episodic insertion of easily identifiable fragments.

The fact is that Biblical studies have made considerable advance beyond the use of these terms generally observable in the literature under consideration. As the term is now used the redactor is one who takes various traditions and ideas (both oral and written) and gives to them a particular doctrinal or theological significance by the way he puts them together. The redactor is not merely an editor or collector of materials, but in fact a genuine "author." What he presents is new and uniquely his own.

On the other hand, even an interpolator who works with an already existing document modifies it and shapes it to suit his own purpose. He also creates something new. The difference, so crucial for reconstructing the origins and history of a document, can be arrived at only by a careful examination of the literary process by which the present document has reached its final form, and the reconstruction of the stages in that process. But we have seen that questions of origin and prior understandings of what is "Jewish" or "Christian" have so dominated research that this needed examination has not been adequately pursued. It is hardly surprising that under these circumstances the answers arrived at have remained quite inconclusive.

This problem, of bringing the discussion to a level commensurate with more recent understanding of the complex process of editing and redaction, brings us to another issue. Redaction can no longer be defined in purely literary terms. The contents of the materials used in a given process of composition are important, but not merely to feed an abstract debate over whether they are "Jewish" or "Christian.: Every process of composition must be related to a life situation in and for which the document, at every stage, was produced. Historical accuracy requires pressing the question of the community behind each stage of composition. For example, de Jonge never retreated from his conclusion that the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs was a Christian writing. He answered his critics by conceding that the "Christian author" used existing Jewish materials in the composition of his own Christian writing. Although a main pillar in his argument (i.e., his insistence that the Testaments, if Jewish, witness to a kind of Judaism not found elsewhere) was shaken by evidence in Charles, Herford, George Foot Moore, and others that the Judaism in the Testaments is not unlike that testified to in other Jewish materials, his position has not been made untenable by their argument. This he has insisted upon. Given a Jewish milieu for early Christianity, with the resulting inevitable store of shared life and ideas, his argument stands firm. This perhaps suggests that methodologically one issue has been well worked but apparently without progress. Logically, this ought to lead scholars to try a different approach, to back off and look again, to attempt to gain some new perspective on the problem.

De Jonge insisted on the uniqueness of the kind of Judaism seen in the Testaments of the XII, if it is seen as Jewish. Whether or not he is right perhaps can still be open to investigation. However, his argument, regardless of its validity or lack of it, offers other possible alternatives in an approach to the Testaments. What kind of document is produced when the "interpolations" are removed? Is there any way to get at its raison d'être? What kind of community stands back of this particular writing? Can the document be studied on the basis of motifs found both in it and elsewhere? Again, how is the document altered when the interpolations are in place? The question of community again arises--what sort of community reworked and used the document? (Similar qustions and problems run through current study of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel.)

In short, it should be possible to refine the instrument of redaction criticism in order to apply it more precisely to these texts. Redaction criticism akin to studies in the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel has not been applied with any consistency to these documents. This area calls for further investigation.

This effort to get behind the document to the community which produced it calls for one further comment. Although Thomson presented no evidence for his suggestions regarding the situations out of which the Ascension of Isaiah and 4 Ezra were produced, he did appear to be asking the right question about a community setting. Kayser and Sinker are not any more convincing in their argments for Ebionite or Nazarene authorship of the Testaments of the XII than the recent attempts by Dupont-Sommer and Philonenko to place the Testaments in an Essene/Qumran setting. They, too, however, have raised the right questions and have attempted to move in a direction which has been somewhat neglected. This alternative approach to these documents offers possibilities which hopefully scholars will take up in a more precise and serious manner than before.

Several brief concluding remarks are now in order. First, the preceding discussion, as well as the more detailed essays in the chapters on methodology, make it clear that it is rather dubious to try to make sharp distinctions between what is Christian and what is Jewish in materials which were preserved, for the most part, by Christians. Christian preservation alone makes the documents, in a sense, Christian, whether or not they contain characteristically Christian interests and ideas. At this juncture, however, this writer concludes that to isolate with any degree of accuracy "Christian" interpolations depends upon the presence of obvious Christian ideas in the passages under consideration. Beyond that point, certainty is not possible. All available evidence for textual analysis must be utilized to the fullest in isolating additions within a text. To label them as Christian, however, depends upon their characteristically Christian content. We have few clues for identifying what is "Christian" in materials of this type. Christian interests can be clearly seen, but general notions and ideas cannot be used as evidence for "Christian origin." Perhaps, however, this is not the crucial task that it comes to be in later Jewish and Christian history when specific areas of both continuity and conflict can be more fully and precisely defined and recognized.

Second, the survey of the literature has shown--despite the difficulties and frustrations accompanying the process--two directions that must continue in research on these apocalyptic texts. (1) While the presence of Christian materials in a document does not prove Christian origin for the document, it does provide the basis on which the writing can be dealt with from some perspective within early Christianity. This part of our task must continue. These writings were "Christian" to the early Christians, and they can and must be investigated from that perspective. (2) The presence of unmistakably Jewish traditions found at the heart of each of these documents, and in many cases obvious indications of Christian insertions (e.g., identifiable sutures and the like), demand that the investigation continue to seek out whatever can be found regarding ancient Judaism which orginally produced these materials. These two approaches are not contradictory and may lead to worthwhile results in the area of both Christianity and Judaism.

Thus, we are left with documents which cannot be declared with certainty to be either Jewish or Christian. Perhaps one day our historical knowledge of the Jewish heritage of early Christianity will be refined to the degree that we will be able to make more definite distinctions in these materials. A more precise literary-critical analysis of the texts may offer some hope in future work.

Perhaps the discovery of unmistakably pre-Christian MSS of the writings in question will set some of these problems to rest. In the meantime, two questions remain which can and should occupty future study: What does a particular document tell us about Judaism prior to the beginning of the Christian era? What does it say to us about early Christianity It is to these that future scholarship must turn while not neglecting those other matters which now seem to be at a standstill.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Works

Charles, R. H., ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2: *Pseudepigrapha*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913; reissued, 1963. (=*APOT*)

Hennecke, Edgar. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. English trans. edited by R. McL. Wilson. Vol. 2: *Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965. (=*NTA*)

Kautzsch, E., ed. *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. Zweiter Band: *Die Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900. (=*APAT*)

Books and Composite Works

"Abraham, Apocalypse of." *EJR*(1966), p. 4.

"Abraham, Testament of." *UJE* 1(1939): 40.

Abrahams, Israel. "Flavius Josephus and the Jewish Sibyl." In *A Short History of Jewish Literature*, pp. 11-18. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906.

Bamberger, B. J. "Adam, Books of." *IDB*(1962) 1: 44-45.

Becker, Jürgen. *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Band III. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1974.

________. *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Bentzen, Aage. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. 3rd edition. Translated by the author. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gads Forlag, 1957.

Beer, G. "Das Buch Henoch." *APAT* 2: 217-310.

________. "The Martyrdom of Isaiah." *NSHE* 9(1911): 340-341.

________. "Das Martyrium Jesajae." *APAT* 2: 119-127.

________. "Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testamente." *RE*^{3}16(1905): 260-262.

Black, Matthew. "The Development of Judaism in the Greek and Roman Periods." In *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, pp. 693-698. Revised edition. Edited by H. H. Rowley and Matthew Black. New York: Nelson, 1962.

Bowman, Raymond A. "Old Testament Research Between the Great Wars." In *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, pp. 3-31. Edited by Harold R. Willoughby. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Borsch, Frederick Houk. *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.

Box, G. H. *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. London: Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge, 1919.

________. "The Ethiopic Book of Enoch(I Enoch)." In *Judaism in the Greek Period*. Vol. 5 of *The Clarendon Bible; Old Testament*, pp. 219-222. Edited by Herbert Wild and G. H. Box. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1932.

________. "4 Ezra." *APOT* 2: 542-624.

________. *The Testament of Abraham*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge/New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Brandon, S. G. F. "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *DCR*(1970), pp. 22-23.

Brown, Raymond. *The Gospel According to John (i-xii)*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 29. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966.

Burkitt, F. Crawford. *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. London: Oxford University Press, 1914.

Buttenwieser, Moses. "Adam, Books of." *UJE* 1(1939): 78-80.

________. "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *UJE* 1 (1939): 38.

Charles, R. H. *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. London: Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge/ New York: Macmillan, 1918.

________. *The Ascension of Isaiah*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900.

________. *The Ascension of Isaiah*. With an Introduction by G. H. Box. London: Scoiety for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1919.

________. *Book of Enoch*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1893; a second edition appeared, 1912.

________. *The Book of Enoch*. With an Introduction by W. O. E. Oesterley. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

________, and Morfill, W. R. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896.

________. "I Enoch." *APOT* 2: 163-277.

________, and Forbes, Nevill. "2 Enoch, or The Book of the Secrets of Enoch." *APOT* 2: 425-469.

________. *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity--A Critical History*. 2nd edition. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913. Reissued: New York: Schocken Books, 1963.

________. "The Martyrdom of Isaiah." *APOT* 2: 155-162.

________. *Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1914.

________. "Testaments of the XII Patriarchs." *DB(H)* 4 (1911): 721-725.

________. "The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs." *APOT* 2: 282-367.

________. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Edited From Nine MSS., Together With the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908. Reissued 1960.

________. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Translated From the Editor's Greek Text, and Edited, With Introduction, Notes, and Indices.* London: A. and C. Black, 1908.

________. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* With an Introduction by W. O. E. Oesterley. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

[________.] "The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs." *Encyclopedia Biblica*, 1899, 1: 237-241.

[Corrodi, Heinrich]. *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, II. Leipzig: [n. n.], 1781.

Craigie, W. A., trans. "The Testament of Abraham." In *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 9, pp. 183-201. 5th edition. Edited by Allan Menzies. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Denis, Albert-Marie. *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament*. Vol. 1 of *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha*, edited by A. M. Denis and M. de Jonge. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Deane, William J. *Pseudepigrapha: An Account of Certain Apocryphal Sacred Writings of the Jews and Early Christians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891.

Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated in collaboration with the author by Bertram Lee-Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n. d.

Dillmann, August. *Ascensio Isaiae, aethiopice et latine*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1877.

________. *Das Buch Henoch. Uebersetzt und erklärt*. Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1853.

________. "Pseudepigraphen des A. T." *RE*^{2} 12(1883): 341-367.

Dorner, J. A. *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. Trans. from the 2nd German edition by William Lindsay Alexander. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1861-1863.

Drummond, James. The Jewish Messiah. A Critical History of the Messianic Idea Among the Jews From the Rise of the Maccabees to the Closing of the Talmud. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877.

Duensing, H. "Apocalyptic Prophecy of the Early Church: 1. The Fifth and Sixth Books of Esra." Trans. by David Hill. NTA 2: 689-703.

Dupont-Sommer, André. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Trans. by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

________. The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes. Trans. by R. D. Barnett. London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., Ltd., 1954.

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament. An Introduction. 2 vols. Trans. from the 3rd German edition by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

"Enoch, Books of." EJR (1966), p. 129.

Ewald, Georg Heinrich August. Abhandung über des äthiopischen Buches Henokh Entstehung, Sinn, und zusammensetzung. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1854.

________. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Zweiter Ausgabe. Band 7. Göttingen: In der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung, 1859.

Foerster, Werner. From the Exile to Christ. A Historical Introduction to Palestinian Judaism. Trans. from the 3rd revised German edition by Gordon E. Harris. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Fox, George. "Sibylline Books." UJE 9 (1943): 525.

Frabricius, Johan. Albertus, ed. Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti, I. 2nd edition. Hamburg: Theodori Christoph. Felginer, 1722.

Frey, J.-B. "Abraham (Apocalypse d')." DBS 1 (1928): cols. 28-33.

Frost, Stanley Brice. Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth. London: The Epworth Press, 1952.

Fuchs, Hugo. "Enoch, Book of." UJE 4 (1941): 131-133.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. Philosogisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaia. Zweyten Theiles. Leipzig: bey Friedr. Christ. Wilh. Vogel, 1821.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *JE* 1(1901): 91-92.

_______. "Abraham, Testament of." *JE* 1(1901): 93-96.

_______. "Adam, Book of." *JE* 1(1901): 179-180.

_______. "Baruch, Apocalypse of (Greek)." *JE* 2(1902): 549-551.

Glasson, T. Frances. *The Second Advent. The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*. London: Epworth Press, 1945.

González, Justo. *History of Christian Thought*. Vol. 1: *From the Beginnings to the Council of Chalcedon*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.

Grabe, J. E., ed. *Spicilegium SS. Patrum I*. Oxoniae: [n. n.], 1698.

Grosseteste, Robert. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sons of Jacob. Translated out of Greek into Latine, by R. Grosthead . . . and out of his copy . . . now Englished . . .* London: A. Clark, for the Company of Stationers, 1677.

Harnack, Adolf. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. 2 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897.

Harrelson, Walter. "The Significance of 'Last Word' for Intertestamental Ethics." In *Essays in Old Testament Ethics*, pp. 203-213. Edited by James L. Crenshaw and John T. Willis. New York: KTAV, 1974.

Herford, R. T. *Talmud and Apocrypha*. London: The Socino Press, 1933.

Higgins, A. J. B. *Jesus and the Son of Man*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung*. Amsterdam: Editions RODOPI, 1966. [Nachdruck der Ausgabe Jena 1857.]

Hort, Fenton John Anthony. "Adam, Books of." *DCB* 1(1877): 34-39.

Hughes, H. Maldwyn. "3 Baruch, or The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch." *APOT* 2: 527-541.

"Isaiah, Ascension of." *EJR*(1966), p. 204.

Jansen, H. Ludin. *Die Henochgestalt. Eine Vergleichende Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Olso: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1939.

James, M. R. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924.

________. *Apocrypha Anecdota II. Texts and Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897.

________. *The Testament of Abraham. The Greek Text Now First Edited With an Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1892.

Jonge, M. de. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin*. Assen, Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1953.

Klausner, Joseph. *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching*. Trans. from the original Hebrew by Herbert Danby. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.

________. *The Messianic Idea in Israel*. Trans. from the 3rd Hebrew edition by W. F. Stinespring. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.

Kraus, Samuel. "Sibyl." *JE* 11(1908): 319-323.

Kurfess, A. "Apocalyptic Prophecy of the Early Church: 2. Christian Sibyllines." Trans. by R. McL. Wilson. *NTA* 2: 703-745.

Lagrange, M.-J. *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*. Paris: J. Gabalda et Fils, Éditeurs, 1931.

Langen, Joseph. *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*. Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1866.

Laurence, Richard. *Ascensio Isaiae Vatis*. Oxoniae: J. Parker/Londini: F. C. et J. Rivington, 1819.

Lipsius, Richard A. "Enoch, Apocryphal Book of." *DCB* 2(1880): 124-128.

Littmann, Enno. "Enoch, Books of (Ethiopic and Slavonic)." *JE* 5(1903): 179-182.

Littmann, Enno, and Kohler, Kaufmann. "Esdras, Books of." *JE* 5(1903): 219-222.

Lücke, Friedrich. *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes oder Allegemeine Untersuchungen über die apokalyptische Litteratur überhaupt und die Apokalypse des Johannes insbesondere*. Zweyte Auflage. Bonn: bey Eduard Weber, 1852.

Mangenot, E. "Apocalypses Juives.--I. Livre d'Hénoch.--1. Livre éthiopien." *DThC* I, 2(1930): cols. 1480-1482.

Marcus, Ralph. "The Future of Intertestamental Studies." In *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, pp. 190-208. Edited by Harold R. Willoughby. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Martin, François. *Le Livre d'Hénoch*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, Éditeurs, 1906.

Messel, Nils. *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch*. *BZAW*, 35. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1922.

Migne, J.-P., ed. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, II. Paris: Paul Dupont, 1886.

Milik, J. T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. Trans. by J. Strugnell. Studies in Biblical Theology 26. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959.

Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Trans. by G. W. Anderson. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Nickelsburg, George W. E., Jr., ed. *Studies on the Testament of Joseph*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.

Nitzsch, C. I. *De Testamentis duodecim Patriarchorum libro V. T. Pseudepigrapho*. Wittenberg: ex offincina typographica Friderici Immanuelis Siebt., 1810.

North, C. R. "Pentateuchal Criticism." In *Old Testament and Modern Study*, pp. 48-83. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1951.

Odeberg, H. 3 Enoch or The Hebrew Book of Enoch. Edited and Translated for the First Time with Introduction, Commentary & Critical Notes. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1928; reissued, New York: KTAV, 1973.

Oesterley, W. O. E. The Books of the Apocrypha. Their Origin, Teaching and Contents. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1914.

Otto, Rudolf. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Trans. from the Revised German Edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf. Boston: Starr King Press, 1957.

Perrin, Norman. What Is Redaction Criticism? Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. History of New Testament Times. With an Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.

Philippi, Ferdinand. Das Buch Henoch, sein Zeitalter und sein Verhältniss zum Judasbriefe. Stuttgart: Verlag von S. G. Liesching, 1868.

Philonenko, Marc. Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qoumrân. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960.

Picard, J.-C. Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece. In Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece, 2: 61-96. Edited by A.M. Denis and M. de Jonge. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Plöger, O. "Henochbücher." RGG^3 3(1959): 222-225.

Porter, F. C. The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Potter, C. F. Did Jesus Write This Book? New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1965.

Rad, Gerhard von. Genesis. Trans. by John Marks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

________. Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Trans. by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Reid, Georg J. "The Apocalypse of Abraham." *CathEnc* 1(1907): 604.

________. "The Book of Henoch (Ethiopic)." *CathEnc* 1(1907): 602-603.

Riessler, Paul, ed. *Altjüdisches Schrifttum Ausserhalb der Bibel*. 2nd edition. Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1966.

Rist, Martin. "Apocalypticism." *IDB* 1(1962): 157-161.

________. "Enoch, Book of." *IDB* 2(1962): 103-105.

Ritschl, Albrecht. *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*. Bonn: Adolph-Narcus, 1850.

Robinson, James M. "On the *Gattung* of Mark (and John)." In *Jesus and Man's Hope*, 2 vols, 1: 99-129. Pittsburgh Festival on the Gospels, 1970. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970-1971.

Rost, l. "Testamente der XII Patriarchen." *RGG*^{3} 6(1962): cols. 701-702.

Rowley, H. H. "Apocalyptic Literature." In *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, revised edition, pp. 484-488. Edited by H. H. Rowley and Matthew Black. New York: Nelson, 1962.

________. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*. Revised edition. New York: Association Press, 1963.

Russell, D. S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Rylaarsdam, J. Coert. "Intertestamental Studies Since Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*." In *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, 32-51. Edited by Harold R. Willoughby. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Sandmel, Samuel. *Two Living Traditions. Essays on Religion and the Bible*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972.

Schmidt, N. "The Apocalypse of Noah and the Parables of Enoch." In *Oriental Studies Dedicated to Paul Haupt*, pp. 111-123. Edited by C. Adler and A. Ember. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1926.

________. "The Original Language of the Parables of Enoch." In Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper. 2 vols.; 2:327-350. Edited by R. F. Harper, Francis Brown, and George Foot Moore. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908.

Schnapp, Friedrich. "Die Testamente der 12 Patriarchen." APAT 2:458-506.

________. Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1884.

Schodde, George H. The Book of Enoch. Translated from the Ethiopic with Inroduction and Notes. Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1882.

Schürer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. 2nd revised edition. Trans. by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. Second Division, vol. 3. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. This volume was reissued in 1972 by Schocken Books under the title: The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus. Edited with an Introduction by Nahum N. Glatzer.

Sinker, Robert. "Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum." DCB 4(1887): 865-874.

________. The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs: An Attempt to Estimate Their Historic and Dogmatic Worth. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1869.

Sjöberg, Erik. Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946.

Smith, Morton. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The." IDB 4(1962): 575-579.

Stone, Michael E. The Testament of Abraham. The Greek Recensions. Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Thackeray, H. St. J. "Esdras, Second Book of." DB(H) 1(1911): 763-766.

Thomson, John E. H. Books Which Influenced Our Lord and His Apostles. Being a Critical Review of Apocalyptic Jewish Ligerature. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1891.

Tisserant, Eugène. *Ascension d'Isaie, traduction de la version ethiopienne avec les principales variantes*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1909.

Tödt, H. E. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. *The Apocryphal Literature. A Brief Introduction*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.

________. *Our Translated Gospels*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1936.

Turner, Nigel. "Esdras, Books of." *IDB* 2(1962): 140-142.

Vaillant, A. *Le Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch. Texte Slave et Traduction Française*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 1952.

Vielhauer, Philip. "Apocalypses and Related Subjects--Introduction." *NTA* 2: 581-642.

Vorstman, J. M. *Disquisitio de Testamentorum origine et pretio*. Rotterdam: P. C. Hoog, 1857.

Weiser, Artur. *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton. New York: Association Press, 1961.

Weisse, H. *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1856.

Wells, L. S. A. "The Books of Adam and Eve." *APOT* 2: 123-154.

Werbeck, W. "Baruchschriften, apokryphe." *RGG*^{3} 1(1957): cols. 900-903.

Zimmerli, W., and Jeremias, J. *The Servant of God*. Revised edition. Studies in Biblical Theology 20. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1957.

Journals

Badham, F. P. "The Title 'Son of Man:'" *ThT* 45 (1911): 395-448.

Baljon, J. M. S. "De Testamenten der XII Patriarchen." *Theologische Studiën-Utrecht* 4 (1886): 208-231.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JThS*, o.s. 48 (1947): 1-12.

Beet, Joseph Agar. "New Testament Teaching on the Second Coming of Christ: 1. Preparatory: The Old Testament and the Book of Enoch." *Exp*, 4th Series, 9 (1894): 430-439.

Bickerman, E. J. "The Date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JBL* 69 (1950): 245-260.

Black, Matthew. "Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch." *JThS*, n.s. 3 (1952): 1-10.

________. "The Son of Man in the Old Biblical Literature." *ET* 60 (October 1948): 11-15.

________. "The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus." *ET* 60 (October 1948): 32-36.

Bloch, Joshua. "Some Christological Interpolations in the Ezra-Apocalypse." *HThR* 51 (1958): 87-94.

Bousset, Wilhelm. "Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen: I. Die Ausscheidung der christlichen Interpolationen." *ZNW* 1 (1900): 141-175.

________. "Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen: II. Composition und Zeit der jüdischen Grundschrift." *ZNW* 1 (1900): 187-209.

________. "Ein aramäisches Fragment des Testamentum Levi." *ZNW* 1 (1900): 344-346.

Burch, Vacher. "Material for the Interpretation of the *Ascensio Isaiae*." *JThS*, o.s. 21 (1920): 249-265.

________. "The Literary Unity of the *Ascensio Isaiae*." *JThS*, o.s. 20 (1919): 17-23.

Campbell, J. Y. "The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man." *JThS*, o.s. 48 (1947): 145-155.

Charles, R. H. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch." *JThS*, o.s. 22 (1921): 161-163.

________, and Cowley, A. "An Early Source for the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JQR*, o.s. 19 (1906-07): 566-583.

________. "Messianic Doctrine of the Book of Enoch and Its Influence on the New Testament." *ET* 4 (1892/93): 301-303.

________. "The Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs." *HibJ* 3 (1904/05): 558-573.

________. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Relation to the New Testament." *Exp*, 7th Series, 7 (1909): 111-118.

Conybeare, F. C. "On the Jewish Authorship of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JQR*, o.s. 5 (1892/93): 375-398.

________. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JQR*, o.s. 13 (1901): 258-274.

Cross, F. M. "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text." *IEJ* 16 (1966): 81-95.

________. "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert." *HThR* 47 (1964): 281-299.

Daniélou, Jean. A Review of M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. *RSR* 43 (1955): 563-567.

________. A Review of A. Vaillant, *Le livre des Secrets d'Hénoch*. *RSR* 43 (1955): 569-572.

Dix, G. H. "The Enochic Pentateuch." *JThS*, o.s. 27 (1925/26): 29-42.

Doeve, J. W. A Review of M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. *NedThT* 9 (1954): 49-52.

Dupont-Sommer, André. "Le Testament de Lévi (XVII-XVIII) et la Secte Juive de l'Alliance." *Sem* 4 (1951/52): 33-53.

Edinburgh Review 146 (July 1877): 31-67. A review of works relating to the Sibylline Oracles.

Flusser, David. "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect." *IEJ* 3 (1953): 30-47.

XUM

Fotheringham, J. K. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch." *JThS*, o.s. 20 (1919): 252.

________. "The Easter Calender and the Slavonic Enoch." *JThS*, o.s. 23 (1921/22): 49-56.

Hayman, Henry. "The Book of Enoch in Reference to the New Testament and Early Christian Antiquity." *BW*, n.s. 12 (1898): 37-46.

Higgins, A. J. B. "Priest and Messiah." *VT* 3 (1953): 321-336.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. A Review of *The Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs; an attempt to estimate their historic and dogmatic worth*, by Robert Sinker. *ZWT* 14 (1871): 302-305.

Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach." *NTS* 14 (1967/68): 551-565.

Hofmann, J. Chr. K. "Ueber die Entstehungszeit des Buch Henoch." *ZDMG* 4 (1852): 87-91.

Hughes, H. Maldwyn. "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and Christian Ethics." *IJA* xix (October 1909): 77-79.

Gaster, M. "The Hebrew Text of one of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Society of Biblical Archeology: Proceedings*. 16-17 (February 1894): 33-49.

Gebhardt, Oscar von. "Die Ascensio Isaiae als Heiligenlegende. Aus Cod. Gr. 1534 der Nationalbibliothek zu Paris." *ZWT* 21 (1877/78): 330-353.

Jones, D. R. A Review of M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. *Theology* 57 (1954): 390-392.

Jonge, M. de. "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *NT* 4 (1960): 182-235.

________. "Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *NT* 5 (1962): 311-319.

________. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament." *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 73 (1959): 546-556.

Kallas, James. "The Apocalypse--An Apocalyptic Book?" JBL 86 (1967): 69-80.

Kaplan, Chaim. "Constituent Parts of the Book of Enoch." RExp 27 (1930): 211-217.

Kayser, A. "Die Testamente der XII Patriarchen." Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften in Verbindung mit der theologischen Gesellschaft zu Strassburg 3 (1851): 107-140.

Kohler, Kaufmann. "The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature." JQR, n.s. 11 (1920/21): 145-168.

________. "The Pr-Talmudic Haggada: C. The Apocalypse of Abraham and Its Kindred." JQR, o.s. 7 (1894/95): 581-606.

________. "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada: A. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." JQR, o.s. 5 (1892/93): 399-406.

Ladd, George E. "The Kingdom of God in the Jewish Apocryphal Literature: I Enoch." BS 109 (1952): 318-331; 110 (1953): 32-49.

Manson, T. W. "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels." BJRL 32 (1949/50): 171-193.

Maunder, A. S. D. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch." The Observatory 41 (London 1918): 309-316.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Messianic Teaching in IV. Esdras." IJA xi (October 1907): 8-10; xii (January 1908): 11-13; xvii (April 1909): 29-31.

Pass, H. Leonard, and Arendzen, J. "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi." JQR, o.s. 12 (1900): 651-661.

Perrin, Norman. "Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity; a Suggestion." BR 11 (1966): 17-28.

Plummer, Alfred. "The Relation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs to the Books of the New Testament." Exp 7th Series, 6 (1908): 481-491.

Porter, F. C. "A Source Book of Judaism in New Testament Times." A Review of R. H. Charles, APOT, 1913. AJT 18 (1914): 106-118.

Preuschen, E. "Die armenische Übersetzung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen." ZNW 1 (1900): 106-140.

Rubinstein, Arie. "Hebraisms in the (Slavonic) 'Apocalypse of Abraham.'" JJS 5 (1954): 132-135.

________. "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Henoch." JJS 13 (1962): 1-21.

Sparks, H. F. D. A Review of M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. JThS, n.s. 6 (1955): 287-290.

Thompson, B. "Patristic Use of the Sibylline Oracles." RR 16 (1951/52): 115-136.

Torrey, C. C. "Notes on the Greek Texts of Enoch." JAOS 62 (1942): 52-60.

Turner, Nigel. "The 'Testament of Abraham': Problems in Biblical Greek." NTS 1 (1954/55): 219-223.

Zimmermann, Frank. "The Bilingual Character of I Enoch." JBL 60 (1941): 159-172.

Zuntz, G. "Notes on the Greek Enoch." JBL 61 (1942): 193-204.

Other Sources

Gammie, John G. "Apocalyptic: Its Definition and Relation to Wisdom." An unpublished paper presented to The Society of Biblical Literature, 107th Annual Meeting, October 28-31, 1971, Atlanta, Georgia.

Slingerland, Howard Dixon. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A History of Research with Attendant Conclusions. Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1973.

Swanson, Theodore. "I and II Samuel and the Dead Sea Scrolls." An unpublished paper presented to the Seminar on Biblical Criticism, Professor Walter Harrelson, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, September 27, 1967.

Special Tools for Research

In addition to the bibliographies found in almost every introductory study of the intertestamental period (e.g., Schürer, Eissfeldt, Weiser, Charles, Pfeiffer, and Rowley), the following special bibliographic tools will be helpful to the student of this material.

Delling, Gerhard (ed.). *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur, 1900-1965*. *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 106. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969.

Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1920ff.

Index to Religious Periodical Literature. Chicago: American Theological Library Association, 1949ff.

Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1951ff.

L'Année philologique: Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'Antiquité Gréco-Latine. Publiée par J. Marouzeau. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres."(Published since 1928; indexes from 1924ff.)

Marcus, Ralph. "A Selected Bibliography (1920-1945) of the Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman Period." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 16 (1947): 97-181.